

**Stress in Modern Russian Inflection:  
Patterns and Variation**

In two volumes

**Volume I**

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the School of Slavonic and East European Studies,

University of London

September, 1996

by Nicholas John Ukiah



This thesis examines the patterns of stress found in modern Russian inflectional paradigms (nouns, verbs and adjectives), and variation in these patterns. It also examines the 'retraction' of stress onto prepositions before certain nouns and numerals, for example *на́ день, за́ сорок*, and onto the negative particles *не* and *ни* before the past forms of certain verbs, for example *не́ дан, ни́ было*, and variability in these phenomena.

After a detailed survey of literature in the field, a new approach to the treatment of mobile stress in Russian is proposed, called the 'distinctive approach'. This approach takes as its basis not the movement of stress between word-forms, from one morpheme, or one syllable, to another, but rather the patterns of contrasts made by stress between word-forms, and the resulting phonetic realisation of stems.

This forms the basis of an original categorisation of the inflectional stress patterns found for nouns, verbs and adjectives, which are examined in detail. Areas of instability in the system are identified, as indicated by the existence of stress variants. Certain of these areas are then further investigated by means of a comparison of dictionary data from standard reference works of the last forty years with new research data provided by a survey of twenty-one Muscovites in the age-range 23 to 62; full tables are given containing the results of this investigation. Each word is then discussed in detail, and a summary given of the changes in stress identified for each word-class.

This thesis concludes that there is widespread variation in patterns of mobile stress, and that developments of a varied and disparate nature are taking place in the different parts of the inflectional system. There is, in addition, some evidence that stress mobility, particularly within the sub-paradigm, is being abandoned in favour of fixed stem- or desinence-stress. A reduction in the incidence of stress mobility is also seen in the area of the 'retraction' of stress onto prepositions and negative particles.



# Contents

Vol. I	List of tables	8
	Key to abbreviations	12
	Preface	17
	1. INTRODUCTION	18
	2. SURVEY OF LITERATURE	21
	a) Pre-twentieth-century studies	22
	b) The twentieth century	38
	i) General studies of Russian stress	38
	ii) Specific areas of Russian stress	83
	iii) Works with a pedagogical aim	95
	iv) Historical accentology; other Slavonic languages	96
	v) Previous surveys of Russian stress	104
	The lexicographical sources used in this study	110
	3. THEORETICAL POSITION	112
	Introduction	112
	The morphological approach of this study	112
	a) Nouns	118
	- Introduction	118
	- System of stress	125
	- Variation	140
	b) Prepositions	149
	i) Preposition + noun phrases	153
	ii) Preposition + numeral phrases	156

c) Verbs	160
- System of stress	165
- Variation	179
i) Past indicative	179
ii) Past passive participle short form	180
iii) Past indicative of reflexive verbs	196
iv) Adjectivalisation of past passive participle long form	205
v) Present gerund	209
vi) Other variation	211
d) The negative particles не/ни + past indicative/past passive participle	213
e) Adjectives	214
- System of stress	214
- Variation	219
i) Feminine short form	221
ii) Neuter short form	226
iii) Plural short form	229
<b>4. DICTIONARY &amp; SUMMARISED SURVEY DATA</b>	233
Methodology of the survey	233
Notes on lexicographical sources	239
Data tables (see <i>List of tables</i> )	240
<u>Vol. II</u> <b>5. DISCUSSION</b>	411
a) Nouns	412
i) Class 4 (eg ноздря)	416
- Discussion of data	416
- Summary	440

ii) Class 5 (eg рука )	445
- Discussion of data	445
- Summary	454
iii) Class 6 (eg вода )	456
- Discussion of data	456
- Summary	462
iv) Class 7 (eg ложь )	463
v) Class 8 (eg труд ) & feminine nouns with a PSg-LSg contrast	464
- Discussion of data	464
- Summary	482
vi) Class 9 (eg дети )	487
Conclusions	488
b) Prepositions	491
i) Preposition + noun phrases	491
- with за	492
- with на	507
- with по	528
- with из	535
- with без	538
- with до	539
- with со	542
- with под	543
- with о	548
- with об	548
- with от	549
- with при	550
- with у	551
- with во	551
Summary and conclusions	552

ii) Preposition + numeral phrases	569
- with за	570
- with на	575
- with по	580
- with до	582
- with со	582
- with под	583
- with во	583
Summary and conclusions	584
c) Verbs	590
i) Past indicative and past passive participle	591
- Discussion of data	591
- Summary and conclusions	633
ii) Past indicative of reflexive verbs	642
- Discussion of data	642
- Summary and conclusions	656
iii) Adjectivalisation of past passive participle long form	662
- Discussion of data	662
- Summary and conclusions	672
iv) Present gerund	675
- Discussion of data	675
- Summary and conclusions	679
d) The negative particles не/ни + past indicative/past passive participle	680
- Discussion of data	680
- Summary and conclusions	682
e) Adjectives	683
i) Feminine short form	684
- Discussion of data	684
- Summary and conclusions	701

ii) Masculine, neuter & plural short forms	706
- Discussion of data	706
- Summary and conclusions	757
- masculine short form	757
- neuter short form	758
a) use as an adjective	759
b) use as an adverb	763
c) use as a predicative	765
d) use in set-phrases	766
- plural short form	768
- overall patterns	774
 <b>CONCLUSION</b>	 778
 <b>Bibliography</b>	 787
 <b>Appendices</b>	 809
 A     Text of survey (before random re-ordering)	 809
B     Biographical details of informants	853
C     Full tables of survey results	864

## List of tables

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.1	Stress classes in nouns	135
3.2	Contrasted word-forms in noun stress categories	136
3.3	Morphemic stress of noun classes	136
3.4	Contrasting forms in noun categories 2, 3 & 4	139
3.5	Contrasting forms in noun categories 5 & 6	139
3.6	Contrasting forms in noun categories 7 & 8	139
3.7	Noun stress category sizes	140
3.8	Category 4 nouns not showing variation	142
3.9	Category 4 nouns showing variation	143
3.10	Category 5 nouns not showing variation	144
3.11	Category 5 nouns showing variation	144
3.12	Category 6 nouns not showing variation	145
3.13	Category 6 nouns showing variation	145
3.14	Category 7 nouns not showing variation	146
3.15	Category 7 toponyms	146
3.16	Category 8 nouns showing variation	147
3.17	3rd declension f nouns with PSg-LSg contrast, no variation	147
3.18	3rd decl. f nouns with PSg-LSg contrast, showing variation	148
3.19	Category 9 nouns showing variation	148
3.20	Verbal prefixes which may be stressed	150
3.21	Prepositions which may be stressed, with cases required	151
3.22	Prepositions and verbal prefixes compared	151
3.23	Nouns appearing in preposition + noun phrases	153
3.24	Prepositions appearing in preposition + numeral phrases	156
3.25	Numerals appearing in preposition + numeral phrases	157
3.26	Key to codes for different preposition + numeral phrases	158
3.27	Examples of different preposition + numeral phrases	158
3.28	Morphemic stress in different verb classes	168
3.29	SF contrasts in different verb classes	169
3.30	Verb classes: examples	169
3.31	Morphemic stress in different pppS stress patterns	172
3.32	SF contrasts in different pppS stress patterns	172
3.33	Category 2 verbs	179
3.34	Verbs which may belong to category 2	180
3.35	Sets of category 2 verbs given same indications in OS <sup>*</sup>	181

\* See p. 787

3.36	Key to abbreviations in summarised OS*data, category 2 verbs	186
3.37	Summarised OS*data on category 2 verbs	186
3.38	Sets of category 2 refl've verbs with same indications in OS*	197
3.39	Key to abbreviations in summarised OS data, reflexive verbs	200
3.40	Summarised OS*data, reflexive verbs	200
3.41	PppL & adjL differentiated by stress alone	206
3.42	PppL & adjL differentiated by stress and vowel	207
3.43	Variation in pppL, no differentiation of syntactic function	208
3.44	Present gerunds with unexpected stem-stress	210
3.45	Present gerunds with stress variation	210
3.46	Present active participles with stress variation	211
3.47	Past active participles with stress variation	212
3.48	Past active participles with stress variation	212
3.49	Stress retraction in HE/HM + past/pppS phrases	213
3.50	Morphemic stress of the different adjS classes	215
3.51	SF contrasts in the different adjS classes	215
3.52	Stress patterns of adjS and adjL taken together	217
3.53	Forms contrasted, adjS and adjL together	218
3.54	Pattern 2 (1.1) adjectives with contrasting adjL stress	218
3.55	Variation in contrasts of stress in adjS	220
3.56	Common class 2 adjectives showing no variation	221
3.57	Adjectives showing variation in adjS f	224
3.58	Adjectives showing variation in adjS f and pl	225
3.59	Adjectives showing variation in adjS nt and pl	228
3.60	Adjectives showing variation in adjS nt only	229
3.61	Class 2 adjectives showing variation in adjS pl only	230
3.62	Class 1.2 adjectives showing variation in adjS pl only	232
4.1	Contents of tables, with corresponding sentence numbers	239
4)a)	Nouns	240
4)b)i)	Preposition + noun phrases	264
4)b)ii)	Preposition + numeral phrases	289
4)c)i)	Verbs: past, pppS	298
4)c)ii)	Reflexive verbs: past	345
4)c)iii)	PppL versus adjL	362
4)c)iv)	Present gerund	367
4)d)	Negative particles HE/HM + past/pppS	369
4)e)i)	AdjS f	371
4)e)ii)	AdjS nt, pl, m	382

5.1	Stress classes in nouns	412
5.2	Morphemic stress of noun classes	413
5.3	Kiparsky's codes and equivalent patterns in this study	415
5.4	Nouns following pattern 4 for the majority of speakers	441
5.5	Nouns showing variation in the GPl	442
5.6	Tendencies in nouns in -а/-я and pluralia tantum nouns previously ascribed to pattern 4	443
5.7	Tendencies in other nouns ascribed to pattern 4	444
5.8	Nouns following pattern 5 for the majority of speakers	454
5.9	Tendencies in nouns previously ascribed to pattern 5	455
5.10	Nouns following pattern 6 for the majority of informants	462
5.11	Tendencies in nouns previously ascribed to pattern 6	463
5.12	Category 7 nouns (no variation)	464
5.13	Nouns following pattern 8 for the majority of speakers	482
5.14	Nouns following pattern 3, no PSg-LSg contrast	483
5.15	Nouns displaying a PSg-LSg contrast	483
5.16	Nouns displaying a tendency towards desinence-stress in Sg	484
5.17	Tendencies in nouns which may have a PSg-LSg distinction	484
5.18	PSg-LSg distinctions in i-declension feminine nouns	486
5.19	Nouns following pattern 9	488
5.20	Hierarchy of stress retraction in preposition + noun phrases	492
5.21	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>за</b> + ASg, AP1, ISg	553
5.22	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>на</b> + ASg, AP1, LSg	554
5.23	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>по</b> + ASg, AP1, DSg	557
5.24	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>из(о)</b> + GSg	558
5.25	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>без</b> + GSg	558
5.26	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>до</b> + GSg, GPl	559
5.27	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>со</b> + GSg	560
5.28	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>под</b> + ISg, ASg, AP1	560
5.29	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>о(б)</b> + ASg	561
5.30	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>от</b> + GSg	561
5.31	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>при</b> + PSg	562
5.32	Preposition + noun phrase containing <b>у</b> + GSg	562
5.33	Preposition + noun phrases containing <b>во</b> + LSg, AP1	562
5.34	Preposition + noun phrases, grouped by preposition	563
5.35	Preposition + noun phrases, grouped by noun	566
5.36	Nouns in prep. + noun phrases, grouped by semantic field	567
5.37	Key to codes for different preposition + numeral phrases	569
5.38	Examples of different preposition + numeral phrases	569



5.39	P+Num+N phrases: current situation	585
5.40	Current P+Num+N phrases	586
5.41	P+Num% phrases: current situation	587
5.42	Current P+Num% phrases	588
5.43	Morphemic stress in different verb classes	590
5.44	SF contrasts in different verb classes	590
5.45	Stress patterns of verbs previously ascribed to class 2	634
5.46	PppL forms distinguished from adjL forms by stress	673
5.47	Forms generalising adjectival stress for pppL and adjL	674
5.48	Forms generalising participial stress for pppL and adjL	674
5.49	Present gerund & adverb forms	680
5.50	Negative particle + past phrases displaying retraction	682
5.51	AdjS following pattern 1.1	702
5.52	AdjS varying between patterns 1.1 and 2	703
5.53	AdjS following pattern 2	704
5.54	AdjS m with stem-initial stress	757
5.55	AdjS m stressed on fleeting vowel (theoretical des.-stress)	758
5.56	AdjS nt: informants evenly split between variants	759
5.57	AdjS nt with stem-stress (all or a majority)	760
5.58	AdjS nt with desinence-stress (all or a majority)	761
5.59	AdjS nt, 'normal' versus 'excessive' meaning	762
5.60	AdjS nt as adverb: stem-stress for all or a majority	763
5.61	AdjS nt as adverb: desinence-stress for all or a majority	764
5.62	AdjS nt as predicative: stem-stress for all or a majority	765
5.63	AdjS nt as predicative: des.-stress for all or a majority	765
5.64	AdjS nt in a set-phrase: des.-stress for all or a majority	766
5.65	AdjS nt syntactic differentiation by stress	767
5.66	AdjS pl: informants evenly split between stem- and desinence-stressed variants	768
5.67	AdjS pl with stem-stress (for all or a majority)	769
5.68	AdjS pl with desinence-stress (for all or a majority)	769
5.69	AdjS pl, 'normal' versus 'excessive' meaning	773
5.70	Overall patterns of adj's showing variation in adjS nt/pl	774
C.1	Contents of full tables, with sentence numbers	865

### Key to abbreviations

The following abbreviations or abbreviated expressions are used in the text:

past tense:	past
present or future tense, as applicable to the given form:	pres/fut
masculine:	m
feminine:	f
neuter:	nt
singular:	Sg
plural:	Pl
past passive participle:	
- long form:	pppL
- short form:	pppS
adjective:	
- long form:	adjL
- short form:	adjS
nominative:	N
accusative:	A
genitive:	G
dative:	D
instrumental:	I
prepositional:	P
locative:	L
first person:	1
second person:	2
third person:	3
all pres/fut except 1Sg:	2Sg+
colloquial:	coll.
dialectal:	dial.
figurative:	fig.
imperfective:	impf
indeclinable:	indecl.
literal:	lit.
perfective:	perf
stress-form:	SF
something:	sg.
someone:	s.o.

## Key to stress codes

The following stress codes are used:

Fixed stress:	1
- on the stem (including the root):	1.1
- on the desinence:	1.2

Mobile stress patterns are indicated by the number 2 and upwards.

The following abbreviations are used in the codes assigned to words to indicate their stress patterns:

### Nouns

SF contrast arising in a form which has a zero-desinence:

- NSg (masculine animates) or N/ASg (others):	N
- GP1:	
SF also found elsewhere in the paradigm:	G
SF not found elsewhere in the paradigm:	g

### Verbs

Stress retracted in formation of the pppS:	r
Contrasting SF in the masculine:	m
Stress mobility between the prefix and the desinence:	Px
Desinence-stress in the past nt and f:	°

Information relating to the past passive participle short form is given in round brackets.

### Adjectives

Information relating to the long form is given in round brackets.

## Key to tables

The following symbols and abbreviations are used in the tables:

x	= misread, omitted
√	= (in summarised survey and dictionary data tables) this variant listed in source (in full tables of survey data) this variant given by informant
(-)	= form given in dictionary without further information; see below
(no prep)	= form occurring without a preposition
%	= sentence or phrase boundary, ie word-form is final element in sentence or phrase
[]	= square brackets contain phonetic information; Há п[◊]лe indicates that ◊ is unstressed, but unreduced
''	= single quotation marks contain meaning
()	= round brackets contain obligatory collocation for word-form
(eg)	= possible collocation; word-form can occur with words of similar meaning
(1), (2), etc	= numbered notes, appearing at the end of each table
/	= read as 'or'
'	= (over vowel) indicates presence of main stress
`	= (over vowel) indicates presence of subsidiary stress
dop	= dopustimo 'permissible'
g neprav	= grubo nepravil'no 'grossly wrong'
gr-pro	= grubo-prostorechivoe vyrazhenie 'a coarse expression, appearing in vulgar speech'
maloupot	= maloupotrebitel'noe 'rare'
nar poet	= narodno-poeticheskoe 'in folk poetry'
ne	= ne 'not' (A&O)*, ie the form is incorrect
ne rek	= ne rekomenduetsia 'not recommended'
neprav	= nepravil'no 'incorrect'

\* see p. 787

nesvob	= nesvobodno 'difficult to form', ie the form is unnatural
ne upot	= ne upotrebliaetsia 'not used', ie the form exists, but is not used
poet	= v poeticheskoi rechi 'poetic, in poetic style'
prost	= prostorechie 'vulgar speech'
razg	= razgovornoe 'colloquial'
ustar	= ustarevshee 'obsolete' (AG), ustarevaiushchee 'obsolescent' (OS, Zal.)*, ustareloe 'obsolete' (A&O, SU)* - see below
v pesn	= v pesniakh 'in songs'
vozm	= vozmozhno 'possible'
zatrud	= obrazovanie dannoi formy zatrudnitel'no 'the form given is difficult to form' ie it is unnatural

The symbol (-) is used to indicate that a form is given in a dictionary without accompanying information regarding obligatory or possible collocations, syntactic environment, etc. The dictionary entry may go on to list the same or other forms with accompanying information; this information is entered separately in the tables. The form may also be tested in the survey in a particular context, which the dictionary entry may be thought to imply.

The terms *ustarevshee* (used in AG)\* and *ustareloe* (A&O, SU)\* are equivalent, having the meaning 'obsolete'; *ustarevaiushchee* (OS, Zal.)\* has the meaning 'obsolescent'. Most sources use a single term consistently; Zal.\* uses both *ustarevshee* and *ustarevaiushchee*, but only the latter appears in entries consulted as part of this study. The terms have been treated as equivalents in this investigation.

The transliteration system used in the tables is that of the Library of Congress, except for the following:

й	= i
ё	= yo

\* See p. 787

The following additional codes are used in table 4)b)ii):

P+Num+N	= prep + numeral + noun
P+Num%	= prep + numeral (sentence-final), or form given with no further information in the dictionary
P+cpdNum	= prep + compound or further defined numeral
P+appNum	= prep + approximate numeral
N+P+Num%	= noun + prep + numeral (sentence-final)

Examples of each context are given in Chapter 3, section b)ii). It will be noted that where a dictionary entry gives no further information as regards the environment in which stress is retracted, this has been taken as indicating the environment P+Num% (preposition + numeral, sentence-final).

### Preface

I wish to offer my sincerest gratitude to Professor Charles L. Drage, both for his fundamental contribution to the shaping of this piece of research, and for his wise comments and suggestions in the later stages of work. His tireless academic supervision has been invaluable and his constant support and encouragement have had much to do with this project being brought to completion.

Dr Natasha Kurashova, Ekaterina Butler, Elena Khorishko and Galia Aplin have lent their time and native-speaker intuition with great generosity, and I wish to record my thanks to them. I am also greatly indebted to my informants in Moscow, who provided their time without seeking reward, and whose attendant hospitality often went far beyond the bounds of mere politeness.

I am grateful for the personal support of many individuals who have encouraged me in the undertaking of this project. In particular I wish to offer sincere thanks to Michael Friedrich, Scott Powell, and, above all, my parents; the contribution of their words of support cannot be stressed enough.

This research was undertaken with financial support from the British Academy and from my parents.

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

The present study takes as its subject of scrutiny the complex area of word-stress in modern Russian, and in particular the patterns of stress which occur in word-inflection. Much of the study is taken up with an investigation into the variation that occurs in these stress patterns, that is, the existence of variants, stressed on different syllables, of one particular word-form. Evidence of this type of variation is taken from dictionaries and stress-handbooks produced over the last forty years, and from new research with native speakers carried out by the author. By looking at both current and historical variation in stress patterns, it is possible to identify certain processes or 'directions' of change in the system of stress; ultimately this enables us to understand better the dynamics behind the system as a whole.

Stress patterns are traditionally divided into those where stress is 'fixed' on a particular syllable throughout the inflectional paradigm, and those where stress is 'mobile', falling on different syllables in the different word-forms of the paradigm. When we talk of 'stress mobility', therefore, what is meant is the changes in the position of primary stress within the declensional and conjugational paradigms, or 'paradigmatic stress mobility'. This latter term covers those changes which occur as part of the inflectional morphology of nouns, adjectives (adjS), and verbs (pres/fut, past, pppS).

The present study also looks at changes in the position of primary stress which can be observed between different grammatical categories, a phenomenon which has been called 'categorical stress mobility'. This term covers those changes occurring in the stress of the past indicative forms of verbs, the participles and gerunds, in relation, for example, to the infinitives or present indicatives, in the stress of adverbs in relation to the adjectives from which they are formed, and in the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives in relation to the positive degree. Certain of



these processes involve the addition of word-derivational suffixes, and could thus be considered to belong to derivational morphology.

A slightly different, but closely allied, type of stress movement is found in phrases such as *на́ день, за́ сорок*. This type of stress movement has received less attention in previous studies of word-stress, but is clearly part of the same phenomenon of stress mobility. The present study thus also investigates such 'retractions' of stress onto a preposition before a noun or numeral, and similar retractions of stress onto the negative particles *не* and *ни* before the past forms of certain verbs, for example *не́ дан, ни́ было*.

The problem of stress in inflection has received, and continues to receive, much attention from writers and researchers working in various branches of Russian linguistics. Their work is surveyed in detail in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 presents the theoretical basis of the present study, introducing a new approach to the treatment of mobile stress in Russian, called the 'distinctive approach'. This approach differs from that of other studies in that it takes as its basis not the movement of stress between word-forms, from one morpheme, or one syllable, to another, but rather the patterns of contrasts between word-forms made by stress, and the resulting phonetic realisations of stems. Stress is thus seen primarily as a cue (sometimes one of several) to the grammatical, semantic (ie lexical) or syntactic identity of a word-form.

The system of stress contrasts found between the different word-forms making up one inflectional paradigm provides the basis for an original categorisation of stress patterns in nouns, verbs and adjectives; the categorisation is constructed in such a way that it can also capture important information about which morpheme in a word-form is stressed. This categorisation is presented in full in Chapter 3, which goes on to identify and list the main groups of words for which there is variation in stress. Certain of these groups are then selected for more detailed investigation.

Chapter 4 gives the results, in the form of a series of tables, of a survey of twenty-one Muscovites in the age-range 23 to 62, carried out by the author; the tables also present data from dictionaries and stress-handbooks relating to the words tested in the survey. These results, and their implications for the directions of change in the system, are discussed in detail in Chapter 5. By looking, in this way, both at the patterns found in the language as a whole, and at the variation which occurs in certain of these patterns, the present study provides an overall picture of the functioning of stress in modern Russian inflection, as well as new and up-to-date information on current instability in the system.

## Chapter 2

### Survey of Literature

This chapter contains a survey of works on Russian word-stress and in particular on stress mobility in Russian. The language in question is Contemporary Standard Russian, although naturally works of, for example, the eighteenth century, will refer to the Russian of that period. Where this is not the case, as, for example, with early Church Slavonic grammars, this is clearly noted.

The literature on Russian stress is extensive, spanning several centuries and comprising many hundreds of specialised monographs and articles, as well as more or less sporadic treatments in grammars of Russian and pedagogical works. The survey below is divided into two main sections: the first section discusses the treatment of stress in works from the sixteenth to the end of the nineteenth century; the second covers literature from the twentieth century. Twentieth-century work is further divided into the following areas: general works on Russian stress, including both theoretical works and applied synchronic studies; studies of the specific areas of Russian stress which are under investigation in the present study, such as the stress of the adjS, the past tense, and so on; works on stress with a pedagogical aim; works more properly belonging to the related field of historical accentology (of importance to the present study inasmuch as the extent to which a system is accurate from a historical point of view can be considered one of the criteria on which any account of stress in the modern language can be judged), together with a brief description of other Slavonic languages with mobile stress; and, finally, previous surveys of the language and their findings. This is followed by information on the dictionaries and stress-handbooks from which stress data used in this study are taken (ie the lexicographical sources) and an indication of works consulted dealing with the phonetics of Russian stress.

The orthography of Russian quotations taken from works published before 1918 has been modernised.

### i) Pre-twentieth-century studies

The two earliest Slavonic grammars which survive today are both, in fact, grammars of Church Slavonic. **Zizanii's** *Grammatika Slovenska*, published in Vilnius in 1596, is based very much on a Greek model. In the nominal inflectional paradigms, for example, an article is included, although the existence of such in Church Slavonic is not otherwise attested, and the prepositional case is included with the dative, since the Greek dative had the function of the Russian prepositional. Likewise the section on prosody, which deals with the accentual system, contains rules which are clearly borrowed from Greek concerning the use of the three types of accent marks in Church Slavonic:

- i) the оксия (or острая), ie acute: ´
- ii) the вария (or тяжкая), ie grave: `
- iii) the облечённая, ie circumflex: ^

Zizanii's accent markings are thus a convention taken over from Greek. However, whilst in Greek they have real phonetic and phonological value (originally indicating tone, and later stress), there is no evidence to suggest that in Slavonic there was ever any distinction between the phonetic value of the accents. Rather they were a set of signs, whose usage was subject to strict rules, but whose purpose was primarily to give an appearance of authenticity to the orthography of the document.

In Zizanii's nominal inflectional paradigms it is interesting to note that stress is marked consistently throughout, in contrast to some later grammars of Slavonic and Russian. However, no discussion of stress as such appears, the author essentially presuming an instinctive knowledge of word-stress.

**Smotritskii's** Church Slavonic '*Grammatika*' of 1618/19 shows no movement towards a realisation of the problems of word-stress. Stresses are marked according to convention, as in Zizanii, using the acute, grave and circumflex accents, and rules for their usage are given in the first chapter on

orthography "О правописании". The final chapter of the book deals with the prosody of verse, but is concerned mainly with trying to find long and short vowels in Church Slavonic and with the different types of feet which may be used.

The first grammar of Russian was written by the German **H.W. Ludolf** and published in Oxford in 1696. His '*Grammatika Russica*' is the first to draw the distinction between Russian and Church Slavonic, and to go on to describe the former. It contains, apart from a grammatical outline of the language, a section containing phrases in Russian with a translation, a short word-list of botanical terms, and some comments on morals and religion.

Whilst not without faults, such as the failure to note the difference between /y/ and /i/ and a very limited understanding of hard and soft consonants, the work represents a certain development in the awareness of stress. In an example frequently quoted in later grammars, Ludolf notes that stress sometimes determines the meaning of a word, where it is used to distinguish between two words which would otherwise be homophones. This leads him to state that accent is determined by usage rather than by rules:

Accentus collocatio vocis significationem interdum determinat v.g. *мука*. Si accentum colloques in penultima & dicas *múca* significat cruciatum, si vero in ultima & dicas *mucà* significat farinam. Usu autem potius quam regulis discendus est accentus.

Despite this promising start, however, the work does not go on to discuss stress as such, nor does it mark stress in the paradigms, except very sporadically. Thus the stress of *женá* is given in the NSg, but not in the rest of the paradigm, and Ludolf goes on to say (1696:16) that *дева*, *вода*, and *рука* are declined in the same way, with no remark as to their stress. Later the stress of the adjective *святѣи* is given, together with its comparative and superlative forms (*свѣиши*, *свѣишиши*), and the text of the religious discussion is stressed throughout. This is in accordance with Ludolf's earlier remark (pp.8-9) that stress is not marked in the

vernacular language (Russian) in the same way as it is in printed books (ie Church Slavonic).

**Kopiewitz's** '*Rukovedenie v grammatyku vo slavianorosiiskuiu ili moskovskuiu*' was published in 1706, and purports to be, as its title suggests, a grammar of the Russian language as spoken in Moscow. The morphology, however, is a simplified version of Smotritskii's Church Slavonic grammar, and the work also shows a White Russian influence in places. It seems to be primarily intended as a practical book from which foreigners might learn Russian and contains, like Ludolf, some phrases with translations.

The work is stressed throughout, using the three-way orthographic system described above in accordance with the then current conventions, viz. ', if the stress is on the last syllable, and ' if it is on any other syllable. (This convention is derived from the Greek rule that acute accents on the final syllable of a word are replaced by grave accents if the word is followed by another word). Thus stress is discussed from a purely orthographic point of view:

Pronunciationem accenticum monstrant hi accentus ' ` . Ut vendo продаю non autem продаю, vel продаю, sed продаю.

The Russian grammar attributed to **Adodurov**, which appeared as an anonymous appendix to the '*Deutsch-Lateinisch und Russisches Lexicon...*' published in 1731 in St Petersburg, contains what appears to be the first discussion of mobile stress in Russian. The work takes a more scientific approach than earlier instructional works, and although the author again draws extensively on Smotritskii in his morphological description, Russian words are used, and the desinences given are clearly Russian and not a form of Church Slavonic.

Stress is not marked in the paradigms, but the author is clearly aware of the action of it, at least in distinguishing the GSg from the NPl of nouns such as вода (p.14):

Nehmlich es ist...der Genitivus Singularis allemahl dem Nominativo Pluralis gleich, nur kommt dieser Unterschied dabey vor, daß nehml. der Accent welcher in Genitivo Singularis auf der letzten Silbe beruhet, in Plurali auf

derjenigen haffte, welche vor der letzten Silbe hergehet, als in вода genit. воды ist der Accent auf der letzten Silbe, in Plurali aber bey воды ruhet er schon auf der ersten Silbe so vor der letztern hergehet.

**Trediakovskii**, in his '*Razgovor mezhdú chuzhestrannym chelovekom i rossiiskim ob ortografii...*' (1748), notes that the Russian writing system is based on Greek, and that Russian has inherited certain conventions from Greek which have no real significance in Russian. Thus signs such as ' should be abolished (pp.114-15) "ибо что не нужное, еще и пустое." Similarly, Russian has no acute, grave or circumflex accents, but only one accent: one syllable (whether marked acute or grave) is pronounced 'higher' (выше) than the others. This is the only meaning of the accents in Russian (p.76).

Later (pp.233-35), Trediakovskii comments that there is no difference in the quality of a stressed syllable word-finally as opposed to word-initially or word-medially (the conventional distribution of the acute and grave accents). Thus, he argues, there should just be one accent, called simply сила (his general term for an accent mark) drawn either right to left or left to right; in other words, the acute and grave accents can be replaced by a single stress mark.

In the civil script (гражданская печать) accents are, in fact, only used to differentiate homomorphs, eg рúки and руки́, a practice of which Trediakovskii approves (pp.237-45). He realises, however, that the foreigner does not know the stress of a word if it is not marked, as the Russian does. He further points out that, if Russian stress were fixed as in Polish or French, then the accents would be superfluous. What is needed is for someone to work out the rules of Russian stress (p.243):

...ибо не такое сие есть дело, чтоб оно сверх человеческих сил было. Того ради, весьма желательно, чтоб кто из наших благоволил сей труд воспринять, и изъяснить сие надлежащим образом...

Trediakovskii thus clears away many of the inherited irrelevancies connected with Russian stress and its meaning

and establishes a basis for someone to carry out a more detailed study of word-stress and stress mobility.

This task was not taken up, however, until Barsov's work of some forty years later. Between 1748 and 1788 only two books seem to have appeared which dealt with Russian grammar, neither one of which gave any detailed attention to stress.

The first of these is **Groening's** Russian grammar of 1750, published in Stockholm. It is an expanded version of Adodurov's earlier grammar, and dedicates only four pages to accentuation. The Church Slavonic system of grave, acute and circumflex is used without question, and stress is not marked in the paradigms except to distinguish otherwise identical forms (eg p.87 *pyka*, GSg *pykŭ*, NPl *pyki*). Examples are also given (pp.51-54) of accent diacritics used to distinguish parts of speech, (eg the noun *пѳтом* 'with sweat' from the adverb *потѳм* 'then'), and different nouns (eg *мукѧ* 'flour' versus *мѧка* (sic) 'torture'). It is further noted that the circumflex may be used to distinguish number, (eg *человѧкъ* NSg versus *человѧкъ* GPl). However, no advance is made towards solving the real problems of stress.

**Lomonosov's** '*Rossiiskaia grammatika*', published in 1757 (dated 1755 on the title page), is very disappointing from the point of view of the serious study of word-stress. Despite repeated mentions of stress, it contains no systematic treatment of the topic, and, indeed, stresses are marked inconsistently in the paradigms (eg p.66 *pyka*, stressed throughout the paradigm, in contrast with p.103 *сопок*, stressed throughout, except for the GPl and DPl).

**A.A. Barsov** is by far the most significant figure in the eighteenth century, as far as the study of word-stress in Russian is concerned. As well as stressing his '*Rossiiskaia grammatika*' (1783-88) consistently throughout, he dedicates thirteen pages to stress, and many of his conclusions are today taken as fundamental in the study of word-stress.

He formulates five 'general rules of stress' concerned with orthography, and seven 'particular rules of stress'; the latter begin with a recognition of the problem of stress and its attendant difficulties (pp.79-80 of the 1981 reprint):



...особенных же и подробных правил о том, на который точно склад в каждом слове ударение должно сделать в выговоре, без указания надстрочными знаками, ...поныне из российских Грамматиков никем не предано, по причине великих, и может быть не преодолимых трудностей.

However, he does establish certain facts in his rules, the first of which is that the stress of a word is often retained in forms derived from it (eg *ви́жу* 1Sg pres/fut, *предви́жу* 1Sg pres/fut; *слы́шу* 1Sg pres/fut, *слы́шишь* 2Sg pres/fut, *слы́шал* past m, *слы́шащий* present active participle). This tendency can be contradicted, however, so the rule cannot be taken as general (eg *зна́ю*, but *признаю́*; *водá* NSg, *воды́* GSg, but *во́ду* ASg, *во́ды* NPl).

In what appears to be the first mention of stress in compound words, Barsov claims that these are often stressed on the second part of the compound, a theory which he backs up with several examples (eg *высококня́жеский*, *благоскло́нный*). In this category, importantly, he includes prefixed verbs (eg *признаю́сь*, *приношу́*), whilst pointing out that in some cases a prepositional prefix may attract the stress onto itself (eg *вы́нес*, *по́ддал*, *за́нял*); a similar phenomenon occurs with some other parts of speech (eg *не́кто*).

He is also interested in monosyllabic words which are pronounced with the words which follow or precede them, the whole receiving a single stress; these monosyllables either 'repel' the stress (eg *ви́дели бы*, *сказа́ли же*, *не бу́ду*, *не о́н*) or 'attract' it (eg *на́ море*, *на́ гору*, *за́ море*). In the case of preposition + noun phrases, he points to a stylistic differentiation, stating that it is considered higher style not to move the stress: "*в высоком слогe приличнее выговорить за мо́ре, за мо́рем, на мо́ре, на го́ру.*"

This last grammar of the eighteenth century, then, represents a considerable advance in the study of stress, and fully establishes word-stress as an area worthy of serious study. It brings a more scientific approach to stress than was previously the case, and, whilst remaining dubious as to the possibilities of anyone ever overcoming the 'perhaps insuperable difficulties' of the question, it demonstrates that many useful things can still be said about stress in

Russian, even whilst not solving the problem once and for all.

**Prokopovich-Antonskii** (1812) is the first to mention stress variants (колебания ударения). Their existence, he believed, was due to three main factors (as summarised by Olechnowicz 1974): the Russian language distancing itself from Church Slavonic, and therefore gradually losing its links with the Church Slavonic system of stress; poetic licence; and the influence of foreign languages on Russian.

**Puchmajer** (1820) is the first truly academic work on Russian word-stress. He vastly improves on earlier works in terms of scope and thoroughness, and significantly increases the number of examples, drawing on the recently published Academy dictionaries. He, like Barsov, is pessimistic about the possibility of fully solving the riddle of Russian stress, although for him the difficulty lies in the regional variation of word-stress (p.15):

Den russischen Ton ganz unter feste Regeln zu bringen ist, da er nach den Provinzen abwechselt, höchst schwer, wenn nicht unmöglich.

His first three sections on stress concern stress in word-derivation and word-formation. Of particular interest in his examination of word-inflection is his view on the stress of the present passive participle in -емый (stressed on the antepenultimate syllable, eg желаемый, неминуемый), and his belief that the stress of many adverbs is identical to that of the adj nt (eg белый - бело, холодный - холодно).

The fourth section on stress, entitled '*Ton in der Flexion beim Decliniren und Conjugiren*', is of even greater interest. Nouns, adjectives and verbs are covered in some detail, and morphological tables are attached which mark stress consistently. Nouns are examined by gender, and, within this categorisation, by their desinences (eg masculine nouns ending in -й and -ь are treated separately from those ending in a consonant), and, where relevant, by the number of syllables (eg for masculine nouns). In addition, some attempt is made to deal with the problem of fleeting vowels.

The classification of stress in nouns is far from complete, and can easily be criticised in the light of later analyses for being both on occasions inaccurate, and generally too timid. Thus, whilst pointing out some general tendencies in stress for nouns of a particular morphological shape (eg neuter nouns ending in stressed *ó* in the Sg retract their stress in the Pl, and vice versa; non-desinence-stressed feminine nouns have fixed stress), these tendencies are undermined to a certain extent by the many exceptions he lists.

In treating adjectives, he comes to the conclusion that the adjL has fixed stress, and that the adjS can be desinence-stressed in the adjS nt and f, desinence-stressed in just the adjS f, or stem-stressed in all forms; in each case he attempts to list such words. His classification of verbal stress is closely linked with his morphological analysis; he points out that the present active participle (or 'transgressive adjective') is stressed as the 3Pl pres/fut, eg *ищу́щий, ищут*.

Thus, whilst he reaches many conclusions about stress patterns in Russian which are generally accepted today, the stress paradigms are only ever implied, and never made explicit or classified, leaving his work open to the criticism that it lacks a truly scientific approach.

The grammars of Grech (1834) and Vostokov (1844) are of particular importance because of the influence that they had on the latter half of the nineteenth century and first decade of the twentieth century, where they remained the standard grammars of the Russian language in use in education. The ideas about stress contained in these works in this way shaped the thinking of several generations of Russian linguists.

**Grech's** '*Prakticheskaia russkaia grammatika*' (2nd ed. 1834) contains a three-part section devoted to the pronunciation of words, covering general rules of stress, stress mobility, and differentiation between words by means of stress. With new insight into the workings of stress in the language, Grech discusses separately, for the first time, the stress of words when cited in isolation (*произносимые*

порознь ), and when spoken in connection with others (употребляемые в связи с другими ), ie in connected speech.

In the nine pages devoted to mobile stress (pp.438-47), Grech examines declensions, the short forms of the adjective, the formation of the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives, and verbal conjugations.

An important development in methodology introduced by Grech is the classification of stress patterns in nouns in terms of the case from which the stress moves position, an approach which presumes a standard order of word-forms. Thus some masculine nouns change stress from the GSg onwards (eg отец, отцá ), some change stress from the PSg (eg бѣрег, на бегерý ), some from the NPl (eg мáстер, мастерá ), and some from the GPL (eg зúб, зубóв ). In this way, the major patterns of stress are identified, treating each gender in turn.

In his treatment of the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives Grech comes to the conclusion that short comparative adjectives of three syllables are desinence-stressed (ie -ѣе, as in добрѣе ), whilst those which are longer maintain the stress of the positive form (eg горячий, горячѣе ). He rightly identifies comparative forms ending in -же, -че, -ше, and -ще as having penultimate stress (eg хúже, сúше ), and those with two comparatives as having stem-stress (eg мѣньше, мѣнее ).

His sections on forms distinguished by stress and on the stress of connected words are also important. The first lists eleven pages of pairs of words distinguished only by their stress, and is the most exhaustive list of its kind to have appeared at this date. In the second section, on the stress of words in connected speech, Grech discusses the movement of stress onto prepositions, onto numerals (eg двá дня, трѣ часа, a feature of nineteenth-century Russian) and the occurrence of unstressed words such as было and либо. He appears also to be the first to point out the existence of a secondary, weaker stress in compound nouns (p.429).

Vostokov's grammar of Russian (6th ed., 1844) contains an exposition of Russian morphology that is both thorough, and entirely scientific. His treatment of stress is significantly superior to that of Grech, and is impressive

for the number of examples it cites, and the extensive analysis of all possible patterns: ten varieties of verbs are distinguished, for example, which are further divided into ninety morphological prototypes.

For the purposes of describing word-stress, Vostokov is innovative in his division of words morphologically into stem, desinence, preposition and prefix. Nouns are treated thoroughly, with examples being drawn from the various morphological classes identified previously in the grammar. Vostokov follows Grech's system of distinguishing patterns in terms of the case from which the stress changes, but his treatment is more detailed and comprehensive.

Vostokov links the short form adjectives and the past passive participles, identifying the similarity of patterns between the two. Additionally, in his analysis of the stress of comparative forms of adjectives, he correctly sees the link with mobility in the short form of the adjective.

His analysis of the stress of verbs is extremely detailed, and highly complex; it is marred, unfortunately, by the long lists of exceptions that his classification requires, creating a more complicated situation than modern writers believe to be the case. He appears to be the first, however, to discuss the stress of the present gerund in -я /-а, linking it with the stress of the 1Sg pres/fut, the stress of gerunds in -ючи /-учи, derived from the stress of the 1Sg or 2Sg pres/fut, and the stress of the participles.

His treatment of enclitics and proclitics is also notably comprehensive. In addition to areas covered by earlier writers, the stressing of the negative particle *не* is discussed, in combination with the pppS and past of certain verbs (eg *не брал, не брали*), and with certain adjS forms (eg *не люб, не дорог, не молод*).

Vostokov's extensive treatment of morphology is not matched, however, by a desirable economy in classification, which could reduce the material to a relatively simple series of patterns. Instead, the many variations shown are further complicated by a large number of exceptions, demonstrating that improvements in classification must be possible. Moreover, Vostokov does not create a system of categorisation

for stress patterns, which would make his description more readily comprehensible.

It is interesting to note in passing that **Pavskii**, in his '*Filologicheskiiia nabliudeniia...*' (1841), only mentions stress mobility in the notes to his examples of noun declensions; stress mobility is given no treatment in its own right, as a topic worthy of detailed examination. Similarly **Davydov's** '*Opyt obshchesravitel'noi grammatiki russkogo iazyka*' (1854) gives a very brief account of stress.

**Bopp's** '*Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem...*' (1854) is a comparative study of stress systems, with particular emphasis on the correlations between Sanskrit and Greek, but also drawing on examples from Lithuanian, Latin and Russian. The work is of particular importance from the point of view of historical accentology in that it points out the many similarities between Lithuanian and Russian stress. Stress in inflection is examined, from a comparative historical point of view, with examples from Russian such as the desinence-stressed adjS f (pp.97-98) and first conjugation verbs (pp.82-83). More than anything else, this work helped establish Russian (and Slavonic) historical accentology as a discipline in its own right.

**Kayssler's** '*Die Lehre vom russischen Accent:...*' (1866) further expands the field of Russian historical accentology. The work is a full treatment of Russian stress from a historical accentological standpoint, covering nouns by gender, long and short adjectives, comparative and superlative forms, adverbs formed from the adjS nt, and verbs, including gerunds and participles. It also examines enclitics, derived nouns, and stress-differentiated homomorphs.

Kayssler's account of contemporary Russian stress represents a considerable advance in terms of scientific methodology, and it is in this that one of the main contributions of the diachronic accentologists' approach can be seen. Beginning with nouns, Kayssler identifies different patterns of stress, and so posits clearly distinguished numbered classes, giving a large number of examples for each. For example, using a methodology close to that of modern

writers, he divides masculine nouns (whose stress pattern is not determined by their desinence) into the following seven major classes:

1. Desinence-stressed throughout, eg **вóждь**;
2. Desinence-stressed in Pl and LSg in -ý, eg **бéг**;
3. Desinence-stressed in Pl oblique and LSg in -ý, eg **вóлк**;
- 4a. Desinence-stressed in Pl -ы́/-í, eg **мíр**;
- 4b. Desinence-stressed in Pl -á/-я́, eg **гóлос**;
- 5a. Desinence-stressed in Pl oblique, NSg ends in consonant, eg **вóр**;
- 5b. Desinence-stressed in Pl oblique, NSg ends in -ь, eg **гóсть**;
6. Desinence-stressed in LSg in -ý, eg **хóд**;
7. Stress shifts to middle syllable in Pl, eg **ка́мень, каме́нья**.

It is the *paroxytone* nouns (ie those with their stress 'weakened', or shifted to the middle syllable: masculine class 7 nouns, neuter nouns such as **волокно́**, N/APl **воло́кна**, and feminine nouns such as **остро́та**, colloquial Pl **остро́ты**) that primarily interest Kayssler in his historical study.

The adjS is examined in detail in terms of its stress, and compared to the pppS forms. It is noted that the adjS nt is also potentially an adverb, but that its use in the two different word classes may be distinguished by stress, eg **гру́зно** (adjective) versus **гру́зно** (adverb).

In his examination of verbs Kayssler draws attention to the two stems of the verb which must be known in order to predict the stress of most parts of the verb: the present stem (giving the pres/fut, imperative, present participle and present gerund), and the infinitive stem (giving the past, past gerunds, ppp and infinitive). The three major areas of difficulty which remain after this is established are the 1Sg pres/fut (which may be desinence-stressed when the 2Sg+ pres/fut is stem-stressed), the participles, and the past f, nt and pl.

Kayssler goes on to discuss word-formation and enclitics in separate chapters. The latter chapter includes a discussion of preposition + noun and preposition + numeral phrases; he states explicitly (p.92) that prepositions may acquire the stress only when before nouns or numerals which have mobile stress (noted in Vostokov, 1844) and which are stressed on the first syllable, eg бѣрег, на бѣрег, but на бѣрегѹ.

**Bystrow's** *'Regeln über den Accent in der russischen Sprache'* (1884) contains a fairly comprehensive account of Russian word-stress. Its purpose is primarily pedagogical, and to this end some of the more complicated features are simplified at the expense of accuracy. Nouns are divided into eight classes, covering most, but not quite all, possible stress patterns; these classes cut across gender boundaries. However, having established these classes, Bystrow lists nouns by their endings, not referring back to his classification system at all.

In his treatment of verbs, Bystrow separates the pres/fut from the past, and takes a different approach for each. Thus for the pres/fut he finds four major patterns according to the place of stress: as in the infinitive; on the desinence; on the vowel before the desinence; or on the desinence of the 1Sg, and the penultimate syllable of 2Sg+. For the past indicative there are five classes, and all verbs are classed into these according to their morphology: Class I consists of verbs in -ать, -ять, -ить, -ыть, -отъ, -уть, -нуть, all of which are stressed in the past as in the infinitive; Class II is made up of verbs in -еть, in which the stress in the past is on the root; and so on.

Overall, the picture given is one that belies the actual complexity of the Russian stress system. Where expedient, difficult areas are glossed over (such is the case with the stress of the adjS nt when used as an adverb, which is not discussed); elsewhere, a simple classification gives rise to long lists of exceptions, as is the case with verbs. As a handbook to Russian word-stress, however, the book is certainly the best of its kind to appear in the nineteenth century.



Grot's two influential articles on verbal stress (collected in Grot 1885) in fact add little that is new to this area of study. The first, '*O spriazhenii...*', demonstrates the importance of giving two fundamental forms (основные формы) of any verb in grammars and dictionaries. Grot decides that these two must be the infinitive and the pres/fut 3Pl; from these all other forms can be derived, although exceptions must be noted. In the second article on verbs, '*O glagolakh...*', he points out some more general tendencies in verbal stress, discussing variants in the 2Sg pres/fut of some verbs, the effects of adding prefixes to verbs, and the action of the reflexive particle -ся.

In his article '*O russkom udarenii voobshche i ob udarenii imen sushchestvitel'nykh*' (also included in Grot 1885), Grot reaches some rather more interesting conclusions. He is the first writer to try to discover what the motivation might be for mobile stress, and what rules might govern stress mobility (p.390):

...есть ли в русском языке возможность определить эти законы [ударения], или они до такой степени неощутительны и неуловимы, что установить их невозможно?

The two separate areas which must be examined are, first, the placement of the stress in the 'direct' ("в прямой или так-сказать заглавной форме слова") form of the word, ie the NSg of nouns, and the infinitive of verbs, and second, the question of when the stress is fixed, and when it is mobile. The first question is of less relevance to the present study than the second, being concerned mainly with stress in affixation and derivation. It does, however, touch on the stress of compound words, which, Grot writes, are stressed on the second element with very few exceptions. Amongst the exceptions are words such as *блáговесть*, *пóлдень*, *пóлночь*, and some other feminine nouns ending in -ь; these throw the stress back onto the first element of the word.

On the question of when stress is fixed, and when it is mobile (pp.437-51), Grot begins by establishing five theories, all of which are of considerable importance in the later study of stress mobility:

- 1) mobility occurs only in nouns of three syllables or fewer (except сковородá, ASg скóвороду);
- 2) mobile nouns are for the most part simple (underived);
- 3) compound words always have fixed stress;
- 4) nouns with prepositional prefixes can only have mobile stress if stress in the NSg falls on the preposition (eg по́вар, NPl поварá, contrast заво́д, N/APl заво́ды );
- 5) nouns with word-derivational suffixes can only have mobile stress if stress in the NSg falls on the final syllable (usually masculine, eg столя́р, A/GSg столяра́ ).

Grot goes on to discuss nouns by gender, then by the number of syllables, or a particular ending (eg masculine Pl in -á/-я ). In so doing, he comes to several important conclusions, not reached by previous writers, and much repeated by subsequent ones. These are discussed below.

He concludes that the phenomenon of mobile stress is indeed subject to certain conditions (p.451):

...хотя и нельзя теоретически определить всех частных видоизменений перехода ударения в склонении имён существительных, однакож и это явление подчинено известным условиям...

The first and second of these conditions are the number of syllables in a word, and the derivation or formation of a word, as mentioned above. The third factor is the degree of currency, or frequency of usage, of the word. Whilst the degree of movement in stress is not strictly dependent on the frequency of a word, there is definitely some sort of connection between the two. In particular, the more 'alive' a word is, the more 'familiar' it is (усвоено народом ), the more likely it is to have mobile stress, as long as this does not contradict other, stronger linguistic laws. This can be seen, for example, in the movement of foreign loan-words from the

class of nouns with fixed stress to that of those with mobile stress (eg *вра́ч*, A/GSg *врача́*).

Grot's fourth condition is that of the place of the stress in the 'direct' form of the Sg, ie NSg. This is seen, for example, in feminine nouns in *-а/-я* with initial stress if dissyllabic, or middle syllable stress if trisyllabic, both of which always have fixed stress (eg *и́скра*, *карти́на*).

The fifth condition is the logical striving of the language towards the 'determining nature of the desinence'. This is seen, for example, in the fact that, for neuter and masculine nouns, stress movement is between direct and oblique cases, or between the Sg and the Pl. With neuter nouns there is often a stress opposition between the Sg and the Pl, eg *сло́во-слова́*, *се́ло-се́ла*, *о́блако-облака́*. On this, Grot writes (p.448):

В этих случаях всего яснее выражается наклонность языка соединять с ударением цель отличения понятий единства и множества предметов при одинаком окончании в падежах обоих чисел. \e

Likewise this process is to be seen at work in the formation of plurals of masculine nouns in *-á/-я́*, which, he notices (pp.440-41), "беспрерывно делает...новые завоевания". The stressed *-á/-я́* desinence is a clear grammatical marker of plurality both in these formations and in words such as *гла́з*, GSg *гла́за*, NPl *глаза́*.

**Brandt's** '*Nachertanie slavianskoi aktsentologii*' (1880) is an important early work on comparative Slavonic accentology, containing descriptions of various Slavonic languages. A chapter dedicated to Russian stress contains a discussion of stress variants of some nouns, but the details of this discussion are of limited relevance to the present study, and will not be further discussed here.

This concludes our survey of pre-twentieth-century work on stress in Russian. We turn now to studies from the twentieth century, dividing our discussion into different sections, as discussed above (see p.21).

ii) The twentieth century

a) General studies of Russian stress

**Bogoroditskii's** Russian grammar course (1911) gives a fairly weak account of Russian stress. The situation is simplified at the expense of detail and complicated by attempting to deal with all elements of grammar at once, morphology, stress and phonetic transcriptions appearing in the same paradigms. Particular weaknesses are in the treatment of nouns (four stress patterns for each gender, and all difficult cases subsumed inelegantly under these) and in the handling of the stress of comparative adjectives and of the adjS (mentioned only in a footnote, p.210).

**Chernyshev's** work on Russian stress (1912) gives guidance on Russian words where there is disagreement about stress. The factors that cause these variants are identified as the influence of dialects, archaisms, literary versus folk usage, poetic usage, and semantic differentiation.

**Ogienko's** work on Russian literary stress (1914) adds very little to our knowledge of the workings of Russian word-stress. It is very much an overview of the situation, pointing out tendencies and admitting that there are exceptions without listing them. Over half the book is taken up with a dictionary, in which each word is followed by a number referring to one of eight patterns of stress. These eight patterns are a brave, but not entirely successful, attempt to summarise the whole of stress mobility in Russian, reducing it to five patterns exclusively for nouns, two further patterns for nouns and verbs, and one final pattern for verbs alone. The admirable economy of the scheme comes at the expense of detail and accuracy, leaving the work of limited practical use; it does, however, establish a new form and methodology in the study of Russian stress, that of the stress dictionary.

**Agrell's** study of instability in approximately 150 verbs (1917) has been much criticised (eg in Kiparsky 1962, but contrast Nicholson 1968:73-5) for its subjective interpretation of data and the use of a small number of informants. His study, based chiefly on data from three

individual speakers and an examination of Russian poetry, is essentially an attempt to demonstrate that words with variant stresses often undergo subsequent semantic differentiation. One of his most important conclusions is that (p.7):

...у большинства русских существует несомненная тенденция придавать различные оттенки значения в известных словах с двояким (иногда даже трояким) ударением...

Where a verbal variant is stressed on the prefix, he believes that most often the overtone is that the action is carried out "концентрированно", that is, in a momentary fashion or emphasising the result of the action; where it is stressed on the root, the action is carried out процессивно (p.14). Although his conclusions are at times highly questionable, it is beyond doubt that stress variants may acquire particular semantic or stylistic nuances, or be used directly for semantic differentiation.

**Obnorskii's** two-volume work on the declension of the noun (Vol.1:1927, Vol.2:1931) is a case by case examination of Russian nominal morphology with a discussion of stress at the end of each section. His approach is to examine variants from the literary norm for stress in particular word-forms, and to seek to give an explanation for each, or point out general forces at work. These explanations can refer to historical factors (for example, the loss of the dual, or the influence of Church Slavonic, which can explain the existence of variant genitive forms), the influence of dialects and related languages (such as Ukrainian, southern Great Russian dialects), or the working of internal linguistic processes (eg semantic differentiation). Morphological differentiation is seen at work, for example, in adverbs and adverbial phrases formed from genitives, eg утро GSg утра, but adverbial phrases с утра́, до утра́; вѣчер GSg вѣчера, but adverb вчерá.

His examples, whilst drawn from the history of the language, show processes many of which are still active in the language today. He discusses, for example, change by analogy between preposition + noun phrases (eg за хлѣб becomes за́ хлѣб, on the model of за́ соль), and between the different

forms of one word in different cases (eg *пекá* NSg, dialectal ASg *пекý*, under the influence of NSg).

**Trubetzkoy's** influential examination of the morphophonological system of Russian (1934) represents an important advance in thinking about the motivation behind stress mobility. He begins by underlining his belief in the frequent occurrence of stress mobility with a distinctive function (p.34):

Sehr oft wird durch die Akzentbewegung irgendeine grammatische Korrelation, ein Funktions- oder Bedeutungsgegensatz innerhalb eines Paradigmas hervorgehoben...

These oppositions may be of the following types: Sg versus Pl (*женá* - *жéны*); 'non-past' versus past (*сто́нет* - *стонáл*, *хóдит* - *хóдил*); active versus passive (*прочитáл* - *прочíтан*); indicative versus imperative (*пíшете* - *пишíte*); attributive versus predicative (*у́мное* - *умно́*); one case versus another (*ногá* - *но́гу*); one preposition versus another (*в лесу́* - *о ле́се*); one syntactic environment versus another (*ча́с*, GSg *ча́са*, but *два часá*; *ху́й*, GSg *ху́я*, but *ни хуя́*). Stress movement may also simply strengthen the differentiation between a word-form with a zero-desinence and the other word-forms in the paradigm with desinences (eg *корóль* ASg etc *короля́*; *и́мя*, N/APl *именá*, GPl *имён*). These oppositions, he claims, are felt by the speaker (p.35):

In allen diesen Fällen hat die Akzentbewegung einen Sinn, der auch vom Sprachbewußtsein bis zu einem gewissen Grade empfunden wird.

Other oppositions, by contrast, he calls '*sinnlos*', or '*ohne ersichtlichen Grund*', giving examples such as NPl *ро́сти*, A/GPl *ростéй*. These movements are not caused internally or externally, and thus he calls them 'conventional', in contrast to the 'rational' movements caused by oppositions of the types listed above. The existence of these purely conventional stress movements, he argues (see p.35, footnote), makes the search for a rational basis for Russian stress paradigms a pointless exercise.

He continues that in practice, however, it is difficult to separate conventional movements from rational ones, since they are layered on top of and across one another. For example *спина́*, NPl *спíны* is rational, but ASg *спíну* destroys the system; likewise *пустóй* contrasts with *пýст, пýсто*, but then *пустá* disrupts the pattern. Because of this, the link between grammatical and accentual oppositions is weakened. Because of conventional cases such as *пишú, пíшешь* etc, the rational opposition between *пíшете* and *пишíte*, or *пíшет* and *писáл* is 'nur ganz schwach empfunden' - very weakly felt.

Trubetzkoy continues (pp.36-7) that, since most types of stress mobility in the paradigm are not clearly rational, stress mobility within the paradigm has become in most cases unproductive. The only productive mobile stress patterns are two which show clear, rational contrasts, between the active and passive voice in verbs, and between the Sg and Pl in nouns, in the following manner:

- 1) for verbs: the retraction of the stress in the ppp when the past m is stressed on the final syllable, eg *написáл - написан*, cf new words eg *формировáл - формирóван*;
- 2) for nouns: Pl formations in *-á/-я́*, eg *дóктор*, GSg *дóктора*, NPl *докторá*.

Other declensional patterns with a straightforward Sg-Pl opposition are not considered productive since they are only observed in nouns with monosyllabic stems (eg masculine *дáр* -type), are only present in a few examples (eg neuter *слóво* -type, feminine *красотá* -type), or would attract words which, in fact, usually become indeclinable (eg feminine *губá* -type and neuter *окно́* -type, but *фотó* indecl., *бюрó* indecl., *боá* indecl.). Trubetzkoy's conclusions thus have the added importance of introducing the idea of productivity as a consideration in the examination of word-stress paradigms.

**Tesnière** (1937) draws attention to one aspect of the role of frequency in analogical changes of stress in nouns. He believes that often the GPL is the key case, with forms such as the zero-desinence *слéз* increasing the overall

frequency of occurrence of stem-stress for the noun *слеза́*. This, he believes, reinforces the stem-stress of the N/APl, contributing to its resistance to developing desinence-stress by analogy with the DIPPl. He also notes that some GPl forms would appear to be particularly resistant to change, owing to their irregular phonetic shape; the GPl form *сестрёп*, for example, has '*une physiognomie phonétique trop accusée pour qu'elle pût céder facilement*' (p.262), and hence the form remains an isolated relic of former fixed desinence-stress in the Pl sub-paradigm. Confirmation of this theory is provided by the present study (see Chapter 5).

**Avanesov's** study of Russian stress (1955) is primarily an orthoepic work with a pedagogical purpose, as can be seen from its discussion of common mistakes made in the stressing of Russian words; indeed, the book ends with a glossary of some 800 frequently mis-stressed word-forms. The work is considered here, however, for its full account of the action of differentiation on various levels between variant stresses (p.18):

Литературный язык стремится избежать колебаний. При наличии их один из вариантов санкционируется как соответствующий норме, другой изгоняется как неправильный - диалектный..., жаргонный..., просторечный...Если же почему-либо сохраняются оба варианта, то они стремятся дифференцироваться в лексическом, грамматическом или в стилистическом отношении.

He gives examples of many of these processes, such as the dialect variants *поло́жил, облё́гчить*, the jargon variants *милли́метр, до́быча*, and the popular speech variants *красивее́, звони́шь*; stylistic differentiation can be seen in the folkloric variants *моло́дец, се́ребро*, and archaic or bookish variants *нача́тый, избра́нный*. More rarely, two variants may coexist in the language, with no differentiation between them, eg *и́наче, тво́рог, про́бил* 'pierced' past m, *обу́х* 'butt'. The work also contains what appears to be the first detailed investigation of subsidiary stress (*побочное ударение*).

**Nicholson** (1968) deals primarily with problems arising in the notation of stress in lexicographical and encyclopaedic works, grammar manuals and works specifically on stress. It also contains an excellent appraisal of works



on stress from 1888 to the late 1960's, concentrating particularly on works from the late 1940's onwards. Nicholson's division of works on stress into those which follow a 'syllabic principle' and those which follow a 'morphemic principle' (p.94) is a useful one and is followed in the present study. He also repeatedly states his belief that stress variants certainly existed throughout the history of the language, even from the earliest times (see pp.72-3, 102, 108); for this reason, he takes issue with the emphasis placed by writers such as Kiparsky (1966, see below) on finding an 'Urbetonung' for every word-form.

**Red'kin's** study of stress (1971, henceforward Red.) takes a significantly different approach to the classification of noun stress. His study first makes explicit the fact that it deals only with stress mobility where this means movement from stress on one morpheme to stress on another; movements such as that from *о́зеро* to *озёра* are thus not considered at all, since both word-forms are stem-stressed. This is the approach taken by many twentieth-century writers, although some (Zalizniak, Fedianina et al.) also look at stress movements between any syllable.

Nouns are classified according to the position of the stress in the DSg and DPl word-forms, whether this is final (ie desinence-stress) or non-final (ie stem-stress). Four basic accentual patterns are established by this means, for which Red'kin introduces the term *акцентная кривая* ('accentual curve'); these are equivalent to the 'stress paradigms' of other writers' work, and it is far from clear what is gained by this change of terminology. The 'curves' are as follows:

- A: non-final stress in DSg and DPl, eg *болóту, болóтам*;
- B: final stress in DSg and DPl, eg *бобú, бобám*;
- C: non-final stress in DSg, final stress DPl, eg *гóроду, городám*;
- D: final stress in DSg, non-final stress in DPl, eg *женé, жёнам*.

It will be noted that all that this in fact amounts to is a distinction between fixed stem-stress and fixed desinence-

stress in the Sg and Pl sub-paradigms: A = fixed stem-stress in Sg and Pl; B = fixed desinence-stress in Sg and Pl; C = fixed stem-stress in Sg, fixed desinence-stress in Pl; and D is the same thing vice versa.

Since these four patterns cannot account for all Russian nouns, a further six subsidiary patterns are established: A1, B1, B2, B3, C1 and D1. Each of these, however, contains a relatively small number of nouns, which are given in lists. A1, for example, contains only *ребёнок* and *человек*, with their suppletive plurals; B1 contains mainly nouns of the *гвоздь*, *ко́нь* -type; and so on. Even so there is a problem with nouns which have monosyllabic forms either in the DSg alone or in both the DSg and DPl, such as *льдú* - *льдáм*, *днú* - *дóньям*, *вшí* - *вшáм*. Because of these examples, and the generally accepted absence of diachronic or synchronic significance in the form of the dative, it is difficult to see what is gained by such a classification, and, with rare exceptions (eg Khazagerov, 1985), later writers have not taken up his system.

The letter classification is applied in a modified form to adjectives. It is sufficient, according to Red'kin, to look at the *adjL m*, *adjS f* and *adjS nt*, to determine the patterns of adjectival stress. Distinguishing non-final from final stress again (ie stem-stress from desinence-stress), a two-letter classification is given to each pattern, ie AA = non-final stress in all three forms, BB = final stress in all forms, AB = non-final in the *adjL*, final stress in the *adjS f* and *adjS nt*. Two other patterns are identified, the letter C being used to indicate movement between the two forms of the *adjS* considered, although the movement is from final (in the *adjS f*) to non-final (in the *adjS nt*), so the pattern is in fact the equivalent of pattern D in nouns.

The verbal classification, which covers all finite and non-finite parts of the verbal paradigm, again uses a letter classification to show whether stress is final or non-final. In place of the Sg-Pl distinction applied to nouns, the two-way sub-paradigmatic split is between the *pres/fut* and the *past* forms. Here again, however, the implication of each particular letter has changed; thus whilst A still means non-final stress in both parts of the sub-paradigm, B now means

non-final stress in the pres/fut, and final stress in the past. C is the opposite of A, and D the opposite of B. With the use of subsidiary types, as for nouns, a total of fifteen stress patterns are found. For verbs it is further indicated whether the stress, if final, is on a word-derivational suffix, or on a word-inflectional desinence.

Red'kin then investigates how these patterns correlate with the morphological classification of verbs proposed by Karcevski (1927). For example, Karcevski's productive class I contains verbs in -ать/-ять, 3Pl pres/fut -ают/-яют, which display stress patterns A, C and C1; productive class II contains verbs in -еть, 3Pl pres/fut -еют, which display stress patterns A and C; and so on. In this manner, Karcevski's five productive classes (I-V), and seven unproductive verbal classes (A-G) are examined and the stress patterns which occur in each identified.

Lists are given of non-derived words in each section of the book, as well as rules for the stressing of words derived from words belonging to particular stress patterns by means of suffixes (which in turn belong to certain classes, depending on their stress properties in affixation). The book concludes with an index of around 3,000 underived words, followed by nominal, adjectival and verbal suffixes, the stress pattern being indicated for each.

Some of the complexities and inconsistencies of the book have been pointed out above. Red'kin's major contribution, however, is to our understanding of stress in derivation; in the field of stress in inflection, his contribution overall is rather minor: it is difficult to point to more than the introduction of a rather rudimentary two-letter classification for adjectives as being fruitful innovations. His word-lists are also a useful source of data and are frequently drawn upon in the present study.

**Olechnowicz's** *'Teoretyczne zasady dystrybucji rosyjskiego akcentu wyrazowego'* (1974) has, despite its title, little to say about the theoretical basis of stress in Russian. The work's discussion of word-stress mobility is essentially an overview of the situation in modern Russian. Where the book is more interesting is in its treatment of

suffixes and derived words; this is, however, of limited relevance to this study and will not be entered into in detail here.

In his discussion of the changes taking place in Russian today, the author notes the following:

- 1) the movement of words from one stress type to another;
- 2) the tendency of stress to move one or two syllables closer to the beginning of the word, observable in many groups of words;
- 3) levelling (**выравнивание**) of stress in the paradigm, ie the change from mobile stress to fixed stress.

The second tendency, Olechnowicz claims, can be seen clearly in Czech and, historically, in Polish; he thus believes it to be a common Slavonic tendency. Examples from Russian are to be found in the formation of the ppp of verbs in -ИТЬ, -ТИ, -ТЬ, -ЧЬ, -НУТЬ; here the stress is moving one syllable nearer the front of the word-form in relation to the infinitive, eg заснеженный for заснежённый, найденный for найдённый. The tendency is also noticeable in verbs in -ИТЬ, where it can be seen, for example, in movement to the mobile stress type in the pres/fut. There are many examples of this phenomenon in modern Russian, eg бóжишься, replacing божíшься (see 1974:111-13).

Apart from verbs, retraction of stress can also be seen, he claims, in areas such as nouns in -á, eg бедá, formerly desinence-stressed throughout the paradigm, but now stem-stressed in the Pl; the tendency to retraction is also seen in the traditionally desinence-stressed adjS forms, now with stem-stressed variants, eg бѐло, бѐлы.

**Fedianina's** (1976) work on modern Russian stress is primarily a handbook for students, but will be considered here for its useful classification of stress patterns. She <sup>empirically</sup> ~~devises~~ a three-way system like that of Kiparsky (1962, see below), with A = fixed stem-stress, B = fixed desinence-

stress and C = mobile stress. She is the first to use a two-letter system for nouns, with each letter referring to one half of the paradigm, ie the Sg sub-paradigm and the Pl sub-paradigm. Altogether her classification creates ten classes: six mobile stress patterns of the type AB, BA, AC, etc; two fixed patterns ie AA and BB (she also gives patterns ØA, ØB and BØ, where Ø indicates the absence of Sg or Pl forms); and two variations on these, ie C<sub>1</sub>Ø (любо́вь type) and AC<sub>1</sub> (челове́к - лю́ди). Nouns are then examined by gender, and lists are given, along with affixes for derivations. The section ends with rules and hints on how to tell which words belong to which stress classes.

The same methodology is followed for the eight classes of adjectives she identifies (first letter for the adjL, second for the adjS), and the nine classes of verbs (first letter for the pres/fut, second for the past indicative). The verbal classes are then linked to the morphological classification of Kuznetsov (as it appears in Vinogradov, 1952). Imperatives, participles and gerunds are dealt with separately and concisely on a purely morphological basis as derived forms of the verbal paradigm. This treatment of verbs is arguably the most successful seen so far in the study of Russian mobile stress. Separating the pres/fut and the past from the other forms of the verb allows a concise classification of the patterns of stress mobility; the stress of the latter group is certainly more easily dealt with in this way than if it is included in the overall pattern of verbal stress (as in Red.).

We turn now to the contribution of a number of writers taking a 'morphophonemic' approach; this is based on the approach of Trubetzkoy, as developed by Jakobson, and is demonstrated in the work of writers such as Kuryłowicz, Lunt, Worth, Coats, Halle and Stankiewicz. In its most clearly Chomskyan, ie 'generativist' form, this approach posits a series of ordered rules which generate surface (ie actual) forms from underlying morphophonemic entities; this involves a high degree of abstraction, often requiring a large number of rules to take account of 'irregular' data.

Work from this school, although often difficult and removed from actual language data, has led to some interesting insights into particular areas of inflectional stress. An important article by **Worth** (1968a) distinguishes movements of stress between the desinence and the stem-initial syllable (eg *сковорода́* - *сковоро́ду*) from movements between the desinence and the pre-desinential syllable (eg *колесо́* - *колёса*); this enables the useful point to be made that case oppositions, for example the differentiation by stress of the ASg from the other Sg case-forms, or of the N/APl in the Pl sub-paradigm, are only of the first type (see 1968a:790).

Another article by **Worth** (1968b) looks in detail at the 'underlying morphophonemic' stress (roughly equivalent, in practice, to **Zalizniak's** theoretical stress - see below) of the nouns *заём*, *наём*, and nouns of the *любо́вь*, *глу́шь* type. A stressed zero-morpheme is posited stem-finally for the inflected cases of *заём* and *наём*, eg GSg *за́йма* = *зaj*-'Ø-ма; for *любо́вь* and *глу́шь*, whose ISg is unexpectedly stem-stressed, **Worth** posits a stressed zero in the desinence -'Øju, which, again, automatically moves the stress left. *Заём* and *наём* now appear quite regular, and *любо́вь* and *глу́шь* can be assigned fixed desinence-stress. This neat solution, however, will not hold for *пе́ред*, GSg *пе́реда* (see **Coats and <sup>Hart</sup>Halle** 1989:130), although the existence of the N/ASg variant *пе́ред* should also be noted.

A short article by **Marvan** (1983) attempts to explain the peculiar stress characteristics of *дети́* and *люди́* from a generative standpoint. His conclusion, that DIPPl forms are irregular in their surface representation because they are regular at a deep structure level, is surprising, and intriguingly counter-intuitive.

**Halle's** work (1973, modified in 1977) is typical of the morphophonemic school, introducing ten or so ordered rules - a stress assignment rule, a stress distribution rule, a de-stressing rule, a circumflex rule, and the like. His survey of the data is thorough, and his approach applied consistently; however, the approach adds little to our understanding of stress in inflection, where many items must

be marked as exceptional due to their 'irregular' stress. As expected, this approach is more useful when applied to stress in word-derivation; Halle (1977) includes a short section of this. Later work by Halle (see Halle and Vergnaud 1987) concerns metrical theory, and gives examples from a wide range of languages; Russian is not treated in any detail, however, and this work falls beyond the scope of this survey.

Articles by **Stankiewicz**, written over a number of years (collected in Stankiewicz 1979, 1986), have been of considerable influence over other writers (his views are taken up, for example, in Neweklowsky 1972, 1980, 1982). In his examination of forms such as GPL **мáсел, дéнег**, and adjS м **дóлжен, тéпел**, whose stress is difficult to account for, he suggests positing a final zero in the stem, marked 'unstressable' (Stankiewicz 1986:330ff.); unexpected Pl forms such as GPL **сестёр, свинéй, судéй, окóн**, however, must be seen as the realisation of a stressed zero occurring stem-finally in the Pl forms (cf Worth's discussion of NSg **наём, заём**, above), although the existence of variants shows that their stress is unstable.

An article by Stankiewicz on verbal stress (1986:353-76) is basically descriptive, comparing the modern language with modern Russian dialects in the light of his understanding of historical stress patterns; it also touches on variants in the standard language. He acknowledges that on specific occasions there may be a differentiation of stress on a syntactic basis, as in the contrasting stress of the pppL and the adjectivalised former pppL, eg **на́ученный** versus **учёный**, **со́леный** versus **солёный**; this is not examined in any detail, however.

**Coats**, whose approach (Coats 1976) is generativist, significantly later rejects this earlier method, and deals more directly with the data as it appears in the actual language. Coats & Hart (1989) signifies a return to 'surface' rather than 'underlying' forms. The approach is still rule-based, although much simplified, proposing a system of conventions (eg a 'Nearest Syllable Convention') and rules which assign stress to a particular syllable in a word-form (eg the first syllable, unless it contains a so-called

'unstressable vowel', as in the first syllable of *профессор* ). At the same time, in common with the approach of other recent writers, stress is now related to other properties, such as the declensional class, the NPl ending, whether the stem ends in a hard or a soft consonant, and so on. The theory also contains a Chomskyan concept of markedness, assigning productive stress patterns 'unmarked' status, and unproductive patterns 'marked' status, this being reflected in the notational system used to indicate the stress properties of lexemes. However, the most striking feature of the system proposed is not that it offers any particularly new insight into the working of stress in Russian nouns - there is very little in their description which has not been already described elsewhere - but rather that it tolerates irregularity within the system, recording certain lexemes as being 'idiosyncratic', rather than attempting to construct a new rule to account for every irregularity. This facet of the approach, unstartling in more traditional analyses, still comes as something of a surprise in work produced by those formerly part of the generativist school.

Perhaps the two most significant modern writers on stress, however, and those who have done the most to shape current studies of Russian stress, are Paul Garde and A. A. Zalizniak. **Garde's** most complete statement of his important theory of Russian word-stress is found in his *Grammaire russe: I Phonologie, Morphologie* (1980) although the theories this work contains appear in various guises in earlier works (in particular Garde 1965, 1978). He devises an entirely new approach to the working of stress in inflectional and derivational morphology, the main points of which, as well as his other contributions to the field, are discussed below.

Garde's theory, which is intimately linked with his understanding of the historical working of stress in Russian, identifies three types of words, according to their stress (1980:116ff.): 'les mots accentogènes' bearing one stress, 'les mots bi-accentogènes' bearing two stresses, and 'clitics', which are unstressed. He continues (p.119):



La place de l'accent dans chaque mot dépend de la structure morphologique du mot. Chacun des morphèmes du mot structuré (racine, suffixes et désinence) a des propriétés accentuelles, c'est-à-dire exerce une certaine influence sur la place de l'accent dans le mot.

Thus **вѣр-ов-а-н-ие** (Garde's morphological analysis) is stressed on the root **вѣр**, as are many other words with this root. Equally, **муч-ѣ-тель** is stressed on **ѣ**, as are most words with the suffix **-и-тель**. The idea of morphemes having inherent accentual qualities is examined in greater detail below.

Garde begins his discussion of stress with the statement that all morphemes have three accentual properties (pp.120ff.). These are *stress*, *place of stress*, and *dominance*. Regarding the property of stress, there are 'stressed morphemes' ('*morphèmes accentués*') and 'unstressed morphemes' ('*morphèmes inaccentués*'). Stressed morphemes move the stress of a word to a place determined in relation to themselves, whilst unstressed morphemes never do this. The latter are noted thus: ° eg <°gorod>; the brackets < > enclose morphophonological transcriptions.

Stressed morphemes can be of three kinds, as regards the place of stress:

i) auto-stressed ('*auto-accentué*') (М') - attracting the stress onto one of its vowels, eg <poród<sup>g</sup>>, порóд<sup>г</sup>;

ii) post-stressed ('*post-accentué*') (М)' - attracting the stress onto the following vowel, eg <korabl<sup>j</sup>'>, корáбль, GSg корабл-я;

iii) pre-stressed ('*pré-accentué*') '(М) - attracting the stress onto the preceding vowel, eg suffix <'iva> in derived impf verbs, eg поворáч-ива-ть.

When a word contains a 'dominant' morpheme (the sign ' or ° is doubled, ie " or °°), the stress properties of that morpheme are realised as if it were the only one in the word.

Morphemes can thus be classed as below; there are seven classes, owing to a gap in the system:

	Auto-str.	Post-str.	Pre-str.	Unstressed
Non-dominant	$\acute{M}$	$M'$	$'M$	$^{\circ}M$
Dominant	$\acute{\acute{M}}$	$M''$		$^{\circ\circ}M$

The classes above are not evenly distributed across all morphemes, however. The following restrictions apply: only derivational (as opposed to inflectional) suffixes can be dominant; only suffixes and desinences can be pre-stressed; roots can only be  $\acute{R}$ ,  $R'$  or  $^{\circ}R$ ; only roots and suffixes can be post-stressed; desinences can only be  $\acute{D}$ ,  $D'$  or  $^{\circ}D$ ; prefixes and 'postfixes' have no stress properties.

Garde continues that the following processes occur:

i) words containing only unstressed morphemes have a recessive stress, ie they are stressed initially, eg  $\langle^{\circ}\text{gorod}+^{\circ}\text{om}\rangle$ ,  $\langle^{\circ}\text{golov}+^{\circ}\text{u}\rangle$ ,  $\langle\text{da}+^{\circ}\text{l}+^{\circ},\text{i}\rangle$ . The recessive accent, subject to certain restrictions, can be retracted onto the beginning of the 'phonological word', ie a preposition, or a prefix, eg  $\text{зá городом}$ ,  $\text{на́ голову}$ ,  $\text{про́дали}$ ;

ii) words containing one or more stressed morphemes are stressed on the place as decided by the first stressed morpheme, eg  $\langle^{\circ}\text{golov}+\acute{a}\rangle$   $\text{голова́}$ ,  $\langle^{\circ}\text{gorod}+\#k'+^{\circ}\text{i}\rangle$   $\text{городки́}$  (# indicates a fleeting vowel),  $\langle\text{pro}+^{\circ}\text{zubr}+\text{'iva}+\text{'t}\rangle$   $\text{прозу́бривать}$ ;

iii) words containing a dominant morpheme are stressed on the place determined by the dominant morpheme, whatever the other morphemes are, eg  $\langle^{\circ}\text{golov}+\acute{\acute{a}}\text{st}+\text{'oj}\rangle$   $\text{голова́стый}$ ;

iv) words containing several dominant morphemes are stressed on the place determined by the last dominant morpheme. This only occurs with borrowed suffixes, eg:

<interv+ <sup>''</sup> enc+'ij+á>	интерв <sup>''</sup> енц-и-я
<interv+ <sup>''</sup> enc+'ij+ <sup>''</sup> on+'oj>	интервенц-и- <sup>''</sup> онн-ый
<interv+ <sup>''</sup> enc+'ij+ <sup>''</sup> on+ <sup>''</sup> izm+°∅>	интервенц-и-он-изм

v) in words with the sequences M''M and M'M', the stress is thrown onto the preceding vowel if the second element is pre-stressed, and onto the following vowel if post-stressed.

So far the theory is coherent and logical. One weakness is acknowledged, however (pp.123-4):

Il existe cependant des morphèmes dont les propriétés accentuelles sont sujettes a des alternances, c'est-à-dire qu'ils manifestent dans certains mots certaines propriétés accentuelles et dans d'autres mots d'autres propriétés.

The majority of these morphemes with variant properties are pre-stressed, ie suffixes or desinences, which will potentially create a problem for Garde's theory when applied to stress mobility in inflection.

Garde admits (p.124) that '*dans la plupart des cas la répartition des deux variantes est imprévisible*'; even where it is predictable, the pattern is not certain. Garde states, for example, that a preceding morpheme which is unstressed will be followed by a variable morpheme that is 'not pre-stressed', but no clue is given as to whether it will be unstressed or auto-stressed. Such variability and unpredictability occurs for example in the 2Sg pres/fut of verbs in -ить, the suffixes of the ppp, and the declension of nouns - in other words, almost everywhere that stress mobility of a complex nature is found. Thus Garde's theory cannot help solve any of the real problems that Russian stress mobility in inflection creates.

In the application of this theory to stress in inflection, the *thème*, ie the stem, is taken as a whole, and not subdivided into root, suffixes, prefixes and so on. Since the stem is at the beginning of the word, it cannot be pre-stressed. To the stem is added a desinence.

Russian words which can be inflected are classed according to two criteria:

- i) according to the stress qualities of their stem -  $\acute{T}$ ,  $'T$  or  $^{\circ}T$ . This gives three *stress paradigms*;
- ii) according to whether the desinences with stress alternation ( $'D/^{\circ}D$  and  $'D/\acute{D}$ ) are in their 'not pre-stressed' form or their pre-stressed form. This allows the discernment of various *stress types*, within the stress paradigms.

Garde takes the example of adjectives to demonstrate this, as shown below. It should be noted, however, that this application is only correct for nouns and adjectives; verbs are treated slightly differently.

Adjectives (and nouns) can be divided into three paradigms and five types. Briefly, these are as follows:

- a) auto-stressed stem: fixed stem-stress, eg *здорово*;
- b) post-stressed stem: fixed desinence-stress, eg *смешно́*, or 'narrow' mobile stress, eg *хорошо́*;
- c) unstressed stem: 'wide' mobile stress, eg *моло́до*, or 'mixed' mobile stress, eg *весе́ло*.

'Narrow' mobile stress displays movement by one syllable in the different forms (*хорошо́* - *хоро́ший*), whereas 'wide' mobile stress shows movement to the edges of the word (*моло́до* - *молодо́й*). 'Mixed' mobile stress shows both features (*весе́ло* - *весела́* - *весёлый*).

Verbs can only be one of three types:

- a) auto-stressed stem: fixed stem-stress;
- b) post-stressed stem: narrow mobile stress;
- c) unstressed stem: fixed desinence-stress.

It is in its application to suffixal derivation that the strength of Garde's theory is seen. It is most successful with regular suffixes, however, although less so with exceptional or irregular cases. The weakness of the theory, however, is in its application to inflectional stress; for example, to nouns ending in *-a*. The stress properties of the desinences are as follows:

ASg:	$^{\circ}D$ or $\acute{D}$
other Sg:	$\acute{D}$
NPl:	$'D/^{\circ}D$
other Sg:	$'D/\acute{D}$

Furthermore, there are six different stress types, according to the stems of the nouns. The desinential variants above combine with the stem types in six different patterns. In other words, only by knowing what accent-type a word is can it be discovered whether, for example, its ASg is  $^{\circ}D$  or  $\acute{D}$ ; even then there are unpredictable variations and exceptions to the rules.

As might be expected, the application of Garde's theory to the formation (derivation) of the participles and gerunds is rather more successful, since this follows rather clearer morphological lines. Thus the present gerund desinence *<a>* is auto-stressed, like the *<ú>* of 1Sg pres/fut (with few exceptions). In the present passive participle, *<óm>* and *<ím>* are auto-stressed, like the 1Sg pres/fut. The pppS is (like the adjS and the past)  $\acute{D}$  in the pppS f and  $^{\circ}D$  in other forms. The pppL shows variation between  $'D$  and  $^{\circ}D$ , but with clear distribution:  $^{\circ}D$  after unstressed morphemes, and  $'D$  after post-stressed morphemes.

Ultimately it is clear that, however great the value of Garde's theory to the understanding of stress in affixation and derivation, its value as regards stress in inflection is of a highly doubtful nature. The real problem of morphemes with variable stress qualities is unresolved (see also Lehfeldt's (1982) review of Garde's theory), and despite the careful adaptation of the theory to fit inflection, there remain exceptions to the rules, such as *ко́нь*, *гвоздь*, *обня́ть*,

крясть. Pragmatically, the system is complicated, especially where it has recourse to variant morphemes, and, with nouns for example, one is still left with different types of declensions, since it is not the case that the same desinences, or the same stems, are always stressed the same way, as demonstrated by the existence of various stress types and stress paradigms.

Before moving on from Garde, it is worth looking briefly at his comments on the stress of the adjS nt. He lists the cases of variant stress (he calls them *hésitations*) in the modern language, and states (1980:218) that '*l'hesitation est souvent liée aux divers emplois possibles du neutre de la forme courte.*' These various uses are as follows:

i) '*prédictat de phrase personnelle (emploi adjectival)*', eg б́удущее светл́о;

ii) '*prédictat de phrase impersonnelle (emploi prédictatif)*', eg в ко́мнате светл́о;

iii) '*subordonné d'un verbe (emploi adverbial)*', eg огóнь светл́о горíт.

He gives the following examples of such contrasts:

adjL	adj.	pred.	adverb
во́льный	во́льно	во́льно	во́льно
грéшный	грéшно	грéшно	грéшно
до́брый	до́бро	до́бро	до́бро
у́мный	у́мно	-	умно́
хи́трый	хи́тро	-	хитро́

From this he concludes the following (p.219):

...l'accent prédésinentiel, identique à celui de la forme longue, est plus répandu dans l'emploi adjectival; tandis que les emplois adverbial et prédictatif, qui sont moins liés à la forme longue, présentent plus souvent l'accent désinentiel.

Perhaps the major figure in late twentieth-century studies of word-stress is **A. A. Zalizniak**. In two early

articles (1963, 1964), he introduces the idea of *условное ударение*, (henceforth 'theoretical stress'), in contrast to *действительное ударение* ('actual stress'), as a way of dealing with the problems of word-forms with a zero-desinence, eg NSg *сто́л*, and GPl *жё́н*. Before this time writers had either treated these forms as having stem-stress, or as having stress as implied by the rest of the paradigm; Zalizniak examines the problem in detail and makes his approach explicit.

Rather than treat these word-forms differently from others, an arbitrary, theoretical stress must be found for all forms (1964:16):

...будем считать, что условное ударение имеют все без исключения словоформы, но у тех словоформ, где оба компонента слоговые, условное ударение совпадает с действительным.

Zalizniak makes explicit the following law, allowing word-forms with a zero-desinence to be included in the system (p.26):

...каждый нуль заменяется тем знаком, который стоит в схеме действительного ударения того же слова в столбце дат. падежа того же числа.

Thus, for word-forms with syllabic desinences, the theoretical stress is the same as the actual stress, and for word-forms with a zero-desinence, it is the same as the actual stress of dative form of that number. The adjS *m* and the past *m* (as well as some other parts of the verb) are also given theoretical stress; in these cases this is the actual stress of the neuter form.

Mustajoki (1981) backs up this position to a large extent, arguing persuasively on the basis of intuitive, descriptive, practical, and even historical criteria. He notes, however, that the '*stól* + 'Ø' position, whilst supported by Fedianina (1976), Red., Coats (1976), Garde (1965), Sheliuto (1962), Unbegaun (1957), Bogoroditskii (1913) et al., does not have unanimous support. In favour of the '*stól* + Ø' position are, amongst others, Olechnowicz (1974), Forsyth (1963), Klepko (1962), and Kiparsky (1950, 1962).

In a monograph dedicated entirely to nominal inflection (1967), which expands his article of 1963, Zalizniak lays out, in a rigorously detailed way, the basis of his treatment of stress. A data-base of some 55,000 nominals is arranged by stress class, and he finds that the accentual pattern of a lexeme can often not be determined from its form, although there is a link with the initial form, the grammatical category, the morphological gender, whether it is a plurale tantum noun, its declension type, and whether the final vowel is fleeting or not (1967:156-57). Of particular importance in relation to the stress class is the nature of the stem; stems are classified in terms of whether they are non-syllabic or syllabic; if syllabic, whether monosyllabic or polysyllabic. They are also divided as to whether they are unstressed or stressed; if they are stressed, according to whether initially or non-initially; if non-initially, as to whether stem-finally or stem-medially. On occasion, Zalizniak gives some indication of what he considers to be the directions of change in nominal stress; the main points are a move towards number opposition in nouns, and the elimination of an ASg differentiated by stress.

This work essentially forms the theoretical accompaniment to his grammatical dictionary of 1977 (henceforth *Zal.*). The latter work summarises his approach to stress for nominals and extends this approach to other parts of speech, giving a complete account of his system of classification of stress mobility in inflection, and in the derivation of grammatical categories such as participles, gerunds and the comparative and superlative forms of the adjective. As it is primarily a reference work, however, enabling the user to discover the full morphology of any given word, its aim is classificatory economy, rather than historical explanation, or the investigation of a linguistic system.

Zalizniak's classification system follows a morphemic approach, discriminating stem- from desinence-stress. Nouns are divided into six main classes, disregarding their gender and whether they are monosyllabic or polysyllabic. Classes a and b display fixed stem- or desinence-stress, class c has



stem-stress in the Sg and desinence-stress in the Pl, class d is the opposite of class c, class e is stem-stressed except for the oblique Pl (G, D, I, P), and class f is desinence-stressed except for the direct Pl (N, A). Four variants on these classes are added, which follow the pattern of their class except for one case: in classes b' and f' the ISg is stem-stressed; in classes d' and f' the ASg is stem-stressed.

The classification of adjectives follows a system similar to that of Red., although making significant improvements. Adjectives are marked with two letters, on the pattern a/c, where the first letter refers to the adjL (a = stem-stressed, b = desinence-stressed), and the second to the adjS as represented by the adjS f, nt and pl. The latter are given a three-way classification (/a, /b, /c: stem-stressed, desinence-stressed, or stem-stressed except the adjS f), which is further refined by three variants (/a', /b', /c') for adjS with variant stress in one form, and a final one (/c'') for adjectives with variant stress in two forms.

The classification of verbs follows Fedianina's model (see Fedianina 1976), with pres/fut (first letter of code) and past (second letter of code) classed in terms of patterns, and the formation of the participles and gerunds explained separately in terms of derivational morphology. Zalizniak includes the imperative in the first letter patterns. Thus a/ = stem-stressed in the pres/fut and imperative, b/ = desinence-stressed, and c/ = stem-stressed except for the 1Sg pres/fut and the imperative Sg and Pl. The second letters refer to the past: /a = stem-stressed, /b = desinence-stressed, and /c = stem-stressed except past f. This is further refined by the addition of class /c' for past forms which show variant stresses.

The stress of the present and past active participles, the present passive participle, and the present and past gerunds are handled simply in morphological terms (as in Fedianina, 1976). The stress of the ppp is rather more complicated, and is explained in relation to Zalizniak's morphological classification of verbs (by their infinitive forms, 1Sg pres/fut, and 3Sg pres/fut) into sixteen different

classes. The stress of the pppS is further linked with the stress of the adjS.

The placing of stress on particular syllables (rather than just particular morphemes) is also discussed, and simple rules for this are given, although, in practice, the dictionary part of the book has recourse to many diacritics indicating sub-classes and exceptional cases in order to deal with all cases of this which are anything other than completely straightforward. Zal. can also be criticised for its failure to discuss the stress movement in the formation of adverbs from the adjS nt, that is, the interrelation in stress between these forms in their various uses (see above, on Garde 1980).

In discussing the stressing of prepositions in preposition + noun and preposition + numeral phrases, Zalizniak is more explanatory (see Zal., pp.71-73). In the first case, prepositions can be stressed in any of the following three situations:

- i) a set-phrase, eg **бо́к о́ бок**; outside of this phrase, stress is not retracted;
- ii) phrases with a certain set meaning, eg **на́ дом** (= **домо́й**); stress is not retracted if the same combination occurs with a different meaning, eg the literal **пти́ца се́ла на до́м**;
- iii) **за** + A, **на** + A, and **по** + D: the meanings are listed where the preposition is stressed; with other meanings, the preposition is unstressed. The preposition is usually unstressed if the phrase is extended (eg **за́ год**, but **за го́д и два ме́сяца** ).

*the variation seen* In situation iii), Zal. points out that there is variation, retraction of stress occurring for some speakers but not others (especially in colloquial speech), and also dependent on factors which he calls **трудно учитываемые** (p.72), such as phrasal rhythm and logical stress. The meanings where stress retraction should occur are given as follows:

за + A:

'behind, across' eg **уйти за реку**

'the place of application of force' eg **взять за руки**

'in the course of a period of time' eg **сделать за день**

'a certain period of time earlier' eg **за год до чего-либо**

на + A, + P (for neuter nouns):

'physical movement in the direction of something, onto something' eg **упасть на пол**

'looking at something' (variation occurs here) eg **смотреть на доску** or **смотреть на доску**

'the place of touching the point of support' eg **встать на ноги**

'for a certain period of time' eg **хватит на зиму**

'measurement of difference' eg **на год старше**

по + D:

'movement over the surface of something' eg **ходить по полу**

'movement within the confines of something' eg **ходить по двору**.

In a later work, Zalizniak (1985:21-22) expresses this slightly differently. What he describes as **нелексистализованные или слабо лексистализованные сочетания** ('non-lexicalised' or 'weakly lexicalised' phrases), where there are many possible meanings of the phrase, tend not to show prepositional stress if the meaning is an abstract, rarely encountered one, eg **обратите внимание на голову**. By contrast, highly lexicalised set phrases (**сочетания с высокой степенью лексистализации**), that is those that are well-established as expressions, are stressed on the preposition, where they have one specific meaning, eg **до смерти**, where the phrase has been adverbialised to some extent (cf also **набок, замуж**, where complete lexicalisation has taken place).

Preposition + numeral phrases generally adhere to the following rules (Zal., p.73):

i) the preposition is stressed if the noun is omitted, and no further specification is given, eg разделить **на** два, **на** три;

ii) if the noun is mentioned, stress on the preposition is still preferred, but this is less regular, eg **за** три **ра́за**;

iii) if the noun is mentioned and positioned first in the phrase (ie the number and the noun are transposed), then the preposition is stressed rather regularly, eg **дня́ на** два, **ле́т за** семь;

iv) if the number is part of a longer number, the preposition is usually unstressed, whether the noun is mentioned or not, eg за **сто́** **пятьдеся́т**;

v) if the number is approximate, the preposition is not stressed, eg за **два́-три́**;

vi) if, however, с **полови́ной** or с **полти́ной** follows the number, the preposition can still be stressed, eg **по́** **два́**/ **по** **два́** с **полови́ной**.

Zalizniak's study of the development of the stress system of Russian (1985) contains what is in many ways an extension of, and improvement on, Garde's theory of the stress properties of morphemes. It is noticeable, however, that Zalizniak abandons Garde's theory for dealing with inflectional patterns, which, as discussed above, is ultimately unsuccessful. Zalizniak's theory of stress in derivation, however, such as the formation of the gerunds and participles, and the comparative and superlative of adjectives, as well as stress in affixation generally, is very clearly a restatement of Garde's principles.

Zalizniak introduces a system of stress types (акцентные типы), which have regular correlations with his stress classes (see above). The stress types are of four varieties:

- i) trivial (тривиальный) - fixed stem-stress;
- ii) (non-trivial) desinence-stress;
- iii) (non-trivial) adjacent mobile stress (смежно-подвижный);
- iv) (non-trivial) marginal mobile stress (маргинально-подвижный).

The adjacent mobile type covers words where only penultimate or desinential stress occurs, eg *величинá, величѐны*; the marginal mobile type refers to words where only desinential or initial stress occurs, eg *головá, гóлову*. Mobile stress of other types is rare, but does occur eg *óзеро*, NP1 *озѐра*. Verbs and adjectives are only divided into trivial and non-trivial types. Applying this system to the stressing of prepositions in preposition + noun phrases, Zalizniak states that this occurs, with very few exceptions, where the noun is of the marginal mobile stress type, that is, demonstrating initial and desinential stress; on closer examination, however, one finds that this can only be seen in the very few examples with nouns with polysyllabic stems occurring in such phrases (eg *зá голову*).

Zalizniak's work contains some discussion of the factors that can affect, and have affected, Russian word-stress. These are summarised, and stated with relation to the effect they have on Russian, in the conclusions that he draws, at the end of his 1985 study, about directions of change. They are as follows:

- 1) an increase in the functional load of stress, in the following ways:
  - a. the *grammaticalisation* of stress within the paradigm, eg a polarisation between the stress of the Sg and the Pl, or certain cases always stressed a certain way;
  - b. the *semanticisation* of stress; groups of words with a similar meaning stressed in a certain way;

c. the *pragmaticisation* of stress; stress distinctions dependent on the familiarity/unfamiliarity of the word;

2) stress movement caused by:

a. the *length of the stem*, ie number of syllables, eg monosyllabic stems > stress moves right; polysyllabic stems > stress on the stem;

b. the *end-phoneme of the stem*, eg the unification of stress in all words which have one particular ending or *финаль*;

3) analogical change where words are linked by meaning (and often by form), eg *ле́вый, налёво* (historically *левóй, налёво*), under the influence of *пра́вый, напра́во*; *дру́жба* owing to *слу́жба*; *на́ семь, на́ восемь* owing to *на́ пять*.

'Grammaticalisation' of stress can be seen in the polarisation and levelling of stress within the paradigm (see below, on Khazagerov 1985). Distinction in stress following a semantic principle can be seen in Zalizniak's grouping of masculine monosyllables in the light of his theory that the names of objects which are *исчисляемые*, ie able to be counted, are stem-stressed, and those which are *неисчисляемые* are desinence-stressed. The nouns are divided into five groups, according to how strongly they are attracted to particular stress patterns; he states, for example, that the names of large masses, including trees, abstract ideas, distances, surfaces and directions are strongly attracted to scheme c, eg *су́п, ше́лк, ды́м, до́лг*.

'Pragmaticisation' takes the form of showing the familiarity (*освоенность*) of a word by assigning it non-trivial stress (ie inflectional, or mobile), as can be seen historically in the shifted stress of *ве́тер, ды́м, жи́д, жу́к, ка́мень*, et al. (see 1985:376). Another example, given by M. Shapiro (1986), is the fact that sports fans give the word *го́л* the stress pattern of *сто́л*, to express familiarity, whereas others give it fixed stem-stress in the Sg and fixed desinence-

stress in the Pl. A pragmatic distinction is also made in adjectives, Zalizniak argues, where bookish terms and those rarely used gain fixed stress, eg **тлѐнный, тлѐнен** 'liable to decay'.

In the adjL (especially if derived) there is a basic principle that qualitative adjectives tend towards stem-stress, and relative adjectives towards desinence-stress. This principle is expanded and refined in Zalizniak (1989), which concludes that non-derived adjL forms also adhere to it, subject to additional 'semantic rules': adjectives (adjL) describing physical and psychological deficiencies tend to have desinence-stress (eg **глухóй, немóй, слепóй**, and even **холостóй, молодóй**); colour terms tend to have stem-stress (eg **бѐлый, чѐрный**); and, despite the basic principle, pairs of opposites often develop opposing stresses (ie falling on a different syllable counting from the beginning of the word), eg **высóкий - нízкий, глубóкий - мѐлкий, ширóкий - úзкий, далёкий - блízкий**. This final, perhaps surprising, tenet is well supported with evidence from the history of the language, dialectal data, and frequency data from the modern language.

stem-final  
consonant

The influence of the ~~(last letter)~~ is one important morphophonological factor in the stress of some words. Zalizniak claims, for example, that if the stem ends in a consonant followed by -т-, then the word may move to class b. This also occurs in monosyllables with a fleeting vowel.

In the adjS, the number of syllables in the stem is important: monosyllabic stems are gaining mobile stress, polysyllabic - fixed. There is also a current tendency towards an opposition in stress between adjL (stem-stressed) and adjS (desinence-stressed) "В кратких формах мн. числа акцентная перестройка совершается на наших глазах" (1985:27). However, the adjS nt in -о may sometimes be resistant to change because of the existence of homonymous adverbs, which have stable stem-stress, and the relatively rare occurrence of the adjS nt. There is also, he claims, a syntactic differentiation by stress, depending on the use of adjS nt: as the 'nominal part of the predicate' eg **моѐ слóво крѐпко**, as the 'so-called predicative', eg **легкó сказа́ть**, or as a 'normal adverb' eg **легкó одѐт** (cf Garde 1980:218-19, discussed above).

Zalizniak (1985:25, 27) is of the opinion that fixed stem-stress in the adjS reflects a 'non-assimilated' (неосвоенный) form, that is, one that is unfamiliar or rarely used in the living language, or has archaic, elevated or bookish overtones. Forms which can potentially be formed, but which very rarely occur in the language, also have this pattern, eg мѣдны, крѣвны.

Familiarity, he believes (p.27) is expressed by patterns of fixed desinence-stress and by the coexistence of stem- and desinence-stressed adjS pl variants. A pattern of stem-stress in the adjS m, nt and pl, but desinence-stress in the adjS f (either as the only possible stress, or as a variant beside stem-stress), he takes as a transitional stage from unfamiliarity to familiarity of the adjective.

The overall movement, he argues (p.27), is towards an adjS-adjL opposition of stress, with stem-stress in the adjL (especially for qualitative adjectives) contrasting with desinence-stress in the adjS. This process is seen most clearly at present in the adjS pl; in the adjS nt, the transition is hindered by their rarity in adjectival use, and the stem-stress of such forms when used as adverbs.

In the verbal system, various factors can influence stress: such as stylistics (bookish, archaic desinence-stress in pres/fut eg воскресѣт, сотворѣт); external features (non-pleophonic forms eg омрачѣт, возвратѣт); denominative character (often desinence-stress, eg бомбѣт, оздоровѣт); transitive versus intransitive (mobile валѣт 'he throws down' versus fixed валѣт 'it flocks'). There is, however, an overwhelming tendency towards mobile stress, which sometimes breaks the above rules, as in звѣнит coll., although it is intransitive.

Zalizniak's theory of stress in derivation is relevant to the present study only inasmuch as he includes in this category the formation of the gerunds and participles, and the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives. His approach is essentially an ~~unacknowledged~~ extension of Garde's theory that individual morphemes have stress properties, and that certain morphemes may be dominant. The strength of this approach is that it seems to reflect the true historical situation of the Russian language. As



Zalizniak points out, it appears that there are different systems at work in derivation and in inflection (in contrast to the system of stress in Old Russian which Zalizniak describes), since an application of this system to inflection necessitates either a great number of symbols marking morpheme properties, or a system of variable markers and weak rules governing when each one is used (cf Garde 1980, discussed above).

Zalizniak argues that in the derivational morphology of modern literary Russian, there are in most cases just two different types of marker for suffixes, ↓ and ←, equivalent to trivial and non-trivial types in inflection. These, as in Garde (1980), can be dominant or non-dominant. Moreover, there are two ways in which suffixes can work: **заменятельно**, ie replacing a morpheme of a particular form of the word, or **аддитивно**, ie added to the stem of the initial form. In other words, a suffix is either added to the stem of the initial form, which has certain stress properties, or to the stem of some other form, which may be identical in form, but have different stress properties. This allows Zalizniak to simplify the system considerably, by saying, for example, that a suffix is added to the end of the stem of the 3Pl pres/fut of a verb, and affected by the stress properties of that stem.

Zalizniak does not assign stress properties to individual morphemes, but to whole stems. These can be *strong*, that is have fixed stem-stress, *weak*, with mobile stress, or *intermediate*, where strength or weakness is decided on the basis of the familiarity of the word. If the stem is strong, it keeps its stress when a non-dominant suffix is added; if it is weak, it is stressed on the suffix (which may in turn pass it back to the stem).

For the purposes of this overview, the following three types of suffix are relevant:

- i) ↓ non-dominant: -енн-, -ом-, -ущ-, -еј(e), -ейш-, -айш-, -я, -им;
- ii) ← non-dominant: -нн-, -т-, -вш-, -ш-, ~~-а, -о, -е~~, -ше.

The suffix -им- is ↓ non-dominant only with impf verbs; it can also combine with perf verbs, to form adjectives such as поправ́имый, неударж́имый; in this case it is dominant, marked ↓D.

To give an example of how the system works, the comparative adjectival suffix -ej(e) is marked ↓. If the stem is weak, the stress will thus fall on the suffix, eg холодн́ее, бел́ее; if the stem is strong, however, it will retain its stress, eg разнооб́разнее. It should be noted that there are some exceptions to this system, which Zalizniak lists. The suffix -ейш-, -айш- is similarly marked ↓. It can work either "заменятельно", replacing the -ej(e) of the comparative form, eg тяжелее - тяжелей́ший, красивее - красивей́ший, or "аддитивно", in forms such as широча́йший, крепча́йший, where it is added onto the initial form rather than the stem of the comparative in -e. Unfortunately, ~~no hint is given as to how to know when this suffix is going to act in the first way rather than the second, and again~~ there is an exception - богатей́ший.

Zalizniak's system of stress in derivational morphology is arguably simpler than Garde's. Both, however, involve a fair degree of abstraction from the speaker-hearer's intuitive knowledge of the language, resorting to the application of variable laws whose action cannot be predicted from the form of the word; with Garde, these laws are truly variable, whilst with Zalizniak they can at least be applied strictly, allowing for some exceptional forms which must be listed. Of the two, therefore, Zalizniak's system is arguably the tighter from a methodological point of view, involving less circularity of argument.

The relation between word frequency and mobile stress is examined in articles by **Mustajoki** (1981b) and **Cubberley** (1987), and in a monograph by Tornow (1984), discussed below. Mustajoki's investigation, which is more satisfactory than that of Cubberley, leads him to conclude that (Mustajoki 1981b:207):

...with commonly used words there is a greater need to distinguish certain word forms, and also more freedom to

depart from the stress pattern of the basic form without the risk of making the word harder to identify;...

**Tornow's** study (1984) is on a far larger scale than the two articles, and his conclusions carry correspondingly greater weight. He first draws up, on the basis of frequency dictionaries, his own core vocabulary of 3,223 inflecting words, and then determines the commonest stress patterns by statistical means, although without making allowance either for the relative frequency of different word-forms within the paradigm, or the presence of defective paradigms (his general statistical approach is criticised in Kempgen 1986). He also looks at variation in his core vocabulary, from the point of view of its function, its link with frequency, and its link with mobility, using data drawn primarily from Gorbachevich (1971, 1973, 1978), Nicholson (1968), Kolesov (1967) and Krysin (1974). The current development of the system of stress is placed in its historical context, with data from Kiparsky (1962) and Vorontsova (1979), and an attempt is made to determine the future prospects of the stress patterns, that is, whether they will survive and attract new words, or lose words to other patterns.

Stress is examined in terms of its link to the number of syllables in the initial form of the word, when this is considered along with information about its inflectional type or conjugational pattern. In his discussion of nouns, he links mobility to certain '*rhythmische Voraussetzungen*' or rhythmic preconditions. Preconditions for mobility are fulfilled, for example, by the following types of nouns: feminine nouns ending in stressed á, and neuter, masculine and third declension (i-type) feminine nouns with monosyllabic stems or with dissyllabic stems and initial stress. Nearly 95% of his core-vocabulary nouns with mobile stress belong to one of these types, and nearly 60% of nouns in the core vocabulary fulfilling these preconditions show mobile stress (1984:297-99). Furthermore, over two-thirds of instances of mobile stress in nouns in the core vocabulary support the number opposition (p.300). This leads him to suggest that the stressed /a/ is the key segment involved, appearing in

feminine mobility and masculine and neuter plurals; it is also, he points out, associated with mobility in the past f of verbs (p.451).

For core-vocabulary adjectives (adjS), mobility as well as variation is found to be linked to the number of syllables in the stem; the more syllables in the stem, the more stable and the more likely to be stem-stressed the word-form. Some 88.8% of monosyllabic-stemmed adjectives display mobile stress, whilst 86.5% of those with dissyllabic stems and all those with more than two syllables in the stem have fixed stem-stress (p.345). Variation takes the form of an increase in occurrence of desinential stress for the neuter and, in particular, the plural short form; in contrast to nouns, no new patterns of mobility arise, but movement of adjectives from one pattern to another leads to the variation that is found (p.349). The reason for this lack of new patterns, Tornow considers, is the rarity of the short form adjective in speech, and the lack of an obvious grammatical opposition similar to the number opposition found in noun paradigms (p.352). Future developments he considers likely are an increase in long forms stressed like the short forms (not adjS f), a levelling of the adverb and predicative with the stress of the adjS nt, and an increase in mobility (feminine desinence-stress versus other forms with stem-stress) for adjective short forms with monosyllabic stems (p.356).

The basic historical tendency identified in Tornow's discussion of verbs (p.368-438) is towards the levelling of stress between the past and the infinitive, possible divergences from this being forms with prefix or negative particle stress (eg *начал, не был*), stress on the reflexive particle (eg *начался*) and past feminine desinence-stress (eg *начала́*). Whilst there is evidence for levelling in the first two types, formations of the *убра́ла* type (desinence-stress replaced by newer stem-stress in past f) are only noted as colloquialisms; more common is a limiting of the divergence from the infinitive, as exemplified in the new, 'narrower' type of mobility found in *позва́л, позвала́* (for previous *по́звал, позвала́*, ie prefix-stress replaced by stem-stress in past m, nt & pl). In the pres/fut, Tornow concludes that mobility is

likely to become more widespread for second conjugation verbs where stress mobility underlines a contrast of mood (хóдите versus ходíte ), but less likely for first conjugation verbs, where this does not occur; this process is hindered for second conjugation verbs, however, by the presence of Church Slavonic features, characteristically accompanied by fixed desinence-stress.

Stress patterns across the word-classes are grouped into the following types: fixed desinence-stress, fixed stem-stress, old, phonetically motivated, 'erweiterte' ('widened') mobile stress (such as in нé был - не быlá; головá - гóлову - нá голову ), and new, grammatically motivated, 'eingeschränkte' ('narrowed') mobile stress (such as in позвáли - позвалá; о́зеро - озе́ра ); these usually concur with Zalizniak's marginal and adjacent mobile types (see above). The two types of mobility are expressed differently in the different word-classes; only the narrowed, grammatically motivated mobility Tornow considers to have future prospects.

Tornow concludes, from the evidence of his core vocabulary, that mobile stress has an apparently contradictory status in Russian inflection; whilst it is disappearing in favour of levelling in the pres/fut of first conjugation verbs, the past, and the adjS, it is developing in nouns and the pres/fut of second conjugation verbs (pp.458-59).

As far as the link between frequency and mobility goes, this is firmly established for nouns (pp.296-97) and adjectives (pp.347-48) by a comparison between the occurrence of mobility in Tornow's core vocabulary, and its occurrence in Zalizniak's base material (Zalizniak 1967:172-74); mobile stress is ten times as common amongst core vocabulary nouns, and strongly over-represented in core adjS forms. For verbs, Tornow compares his figures only with those produced by Vorontsova for her fifth productive class (Vorontsova 1979:230, note 36); mobility is twice as common in such verbs which occur in the core vocabulary.

Concerning variation, Tornow's initial thesis links mobility and instability, since it appears that, in his core vocabulary (p.301):

Mehr als die Hälfte aller Substantive mit eindeutig beweglichem Akzentparadigma ist...Betonungsschwankungen unterworfen.

Ultimately, however, he is forced to reject this notion, since stress mobility in some areas, such as mobility in the pres/fut, is not accompanied by instability. He concludes that, in fact, the more common a word, the more likely accentual doublets are (p.469):

Je öfter ein russisches Lexem verwendet wird, desto eher in akzentuell verschiedenen Formen. Der scheinbare Zusammenhang mit der Mobilität erklärt sich durch die Häufigkeit der Mobilität.

Furthermore, instability is generally due to the 'grammaticalisation' of stress (for example, its increasing use as a marker of number in nouns), or the gradual breakdown of the older, 'phonetically' motivated patterns of mobility.

A similar desire to generalise about the system of stress, by means of a minimisation of the data, is found in **Mustajoki** (1980). In this work, he attempts to formulate, for the stress patterns found in nouns, a 'minimal description of their essential linguistic features for pedagogical application' (p.375). A range of factors are taken account of in this 'minimisation', which reveal some of the difficulties of determining what is more significant, and what less so, in the linguistic system; the factors he considers include the number of lexemes belonging to each stress pattern, later weighted to reflect the frequency of the words following the pattern (the 'weighted lexical probability'); the productivity of the pattern; its future prospects, that is, whether it will survive; and even the probable frequency of occurrence of the words from each pattern in the style of Russian spoken by Finnish students. The difficulty, and subjective nature, of any such evaluation will be readily seen; moreover, such an approach, which attempts to plane down the awkward edges of the system, inevitably distorts the data, and is clearly motivated by a pedagogical, rather than truly analytical, aim.

**Feldstein's** examination of Russian stress is based on a close examination of patterns at a sub-paradigmatic level. In a series of articles (1980, 1984, 1986), he divides each inflectional paradigm into two sub-paradigms: for nouns, the Sg and Pl; for verbs, the past and the pres/fut; for adjectives, adjL and adjS. He identifies six types of sub-paradigmatic stress (eg fixed stem-stress on any syllable, stem-initial stress, stem-initial stress alternating with desinential stress within sub-paradigm, etc), but discovers that 'three of the six stress patterns are in complementary distribution with the other three' (1986:45). His conclusions initially seem simple and attractive, but the processes leading to them are highly complex, and, on closer examination, it appears that to find what the 'external realisation' of the stress types are, ie what actual stress occurs, a morphological categorisation is still needed for nouns and adjectives (p.49) and for verbs (p.53). As far as verbs are concerned, Feldstein's analysis centres on the stem-type, and in particular the presence or absence of a suffix-vowel; patterns found in  $\sqrt{\text{pppS}}$  are then determined by <sup>the</sup> whether such a vowel, if there is one, remains in the formation of  $\sqrt{\text{pppS}}$ . This approach to the verbal system, <sup>the</sup> reminiscent of that found in Townsend's exposition of the single-stem system for the treatment of verbs (1974, cf also Levin 1978), appears to be a fruitful one; it expresses the truth captured by classificatory systems such as that of Zalizniak and others in more explanatory terms. However, it gains nothing over Zalizniak's system in terms of classificatory simplicity; Zalizniak's classification of stress types, taken in combination with his morphological categorisation, expresses the same data in a more readily grasped fashion, and has the advantage of being applied to the vast array of data contained in Zal.

A more recent article by Feldstein (1993) further questions the traditional notion of the traditional binary sub-paradigm (eg Sg-Pl, pres/fut-past); in its place he suggests new sub-paradigms based on desinence (grouping forms with the same ending, eg *пукі́* - *пўки*), or case (forming the six case sub-paradigms NSg-NPl, ASg-APl, GSg-GPl, and so on).

However, although such 'new' sub-paradigms allow for some interesting observations, which are overlooked in the traditional classifications, far more important generalisations (such as the Sg-Pl contrast in nouns) appear to be lost by abandoning the traditional bi-partite sub-paradigms.

**Khazagerov** (1973, 1985) has contributed to our understanding of the processes of change in Russian stress by his examination of the working of analogy (cf the similar approach in Hart 1987, examining mobility in the pres/fut of verbs). His many examples from historical accentology confirm his belief in the increasing grammaticalisation of stress as the motivating force behind such changes, as seen in the increasing use of stress to differentiate the Sg from the Pl (in nouns, verbs, the adjS), direct from oblique cases (in nouns), and such like. Analogy is seen as the prime force behind all change in stress patterns, working via its two processes of polarisation and induction. Polarisation he explains as 'external analogy', and it is to be observed taking place in common words; induction, on the other hand, is so-called 'internal analogy', and is more likely to be seen with infrequently used words.

Khazagerov postulates the following view with regard to polarisation (1985:30):

...поляризационный процесс возникает только в случае одинаковой реализации словесного ударения в исходных словоформах двух акцентных схем.

For example, a word such as стрелá - стрéлы may influence a word such as пчелá - пчёлы, since they share a common stress in the initial form; стрелá and пчелá could not influence кнѝга, since the initial forms are stressed on different syllables. The second process, induction, works via the mechanism expressed in the formula below:

но́вый - новá - новée - новѐйший  
ста́рый - X

Hence: X = старá - старée - старѐйший



with *ста́рее* replacing former *ста́рее*.

Khazagerov discusses in detail the process of polarisation in the category of plurality, in terms of the changes noted in the history of the language in the following areas: the stress contrast between Sg and Pl in nouns; stress in number in verbs (see below); stress in positive versus comparative forms of adjectives (*красный* versus *краснее*); and stress in aspect (eg *обреза́ть* versus *обреза́ть*).

In discussing stress in number, he comments on the feature noted as early as Grot (see Grot 1885), and analysed in precise terms by A. A. Potebnia, of stress differentiation between *собира́тельная множественность* and *индивидуальность*. This can be seen in the opposition of the NSg with the NPl in nouns, and in verb forms such as *пишу́* - *пи́шем*, *ношу́* - *но́сим*. Stress in aspect refers to the polarisation of the perfective as signifying *невозможность деления, недискретность*, ie *один раз*, from the imperfective as signifying *возможность членимости*, ie *много раз*. This is seen either in the direct distinction by stress in pairs such as *насы́пать* - *насыпа́ть*, or in cases where stress is an additional distinguishing feature to the imperfectivising infix, eg *подписа́ть* - *подпи́сывать*.

The other main area where Khazagerov postulates polarisation is in the opposition of subject to object. This can be seen, for example, in areas such as animacy (eg *гу́сь*, NPl *гу́си*, A/GPl *гусе́й*, which in turn has influenced *лебе́дь*, A/GPl *лебеде́й*, earlier *лебедей*), and stress opposition in active versus passive participles (eg *у́знанный* versus *узна́л*, *узна́вший*).

Induction, on the other hand, can be seen in such areas as levelling to the nominative (eg *овца́*, ASg *овцу́* for earlier *овцу*, by analogy with *сестра́*, ASg *сестру́*) or to the infinitive (eg p.138 past *согреши́л*, *согреши́ла* for earlier *со́грешил*, *согрешила́*, on the basis of the infinitive *согреши́ть*, although this example is questionable). He gives a detailed analysis of these areas and others, with examples of changes in stress-patterns from the history of the Russian language, and evidence from present-day instability in the language.

In a brief but insightful article on nominal accentuation in modern Russian, **Kortlandt** (1986) presents the system of stress from the point of view of the contrasts which are drawn between word-forms, and classifies the patterns found accordingly with codes composed of a combination of the signs + (indicating the absence of a contrast and stem-stress) and - (indicating the presence of a contrast). Although the system is presented in outline only, and difficulties which may arise are not discussed, the system is notable for the emphasis it places on the contrasts made by stress, and for the fact that it makes this the basis of its categorisation of stress patterns.

A significantly different approach from that of other writers is taken by the semiotist **M. Shapiro**. His present position is outlined in an article of 1986 (cf also M. Shapiro 1980, 1983, 1985), although his stance has changed noticeably since his earlier work (eg M. Shapiro 1969). He rejects theoretical stress as a concept for dealing with stress mobility, since he believes his semiotic interpretation explains Russian stress without recourse to such abstractions. He also dismisses classifications schemes such as Red., morpheme valency treatments such as Garde's (1980) and Zalizniak's (1985), and rule formation approaches.

His approach assigns values of 'marked' and 'unmarked' to features such as the absence and incidence of stress, the position of the syllable (stem-final and desinential are marked), fixity and mobility of stress in the (sub-)paradigm, and the genders (masculine is unmarked *vis-a-vis* feminine and neuter, neuter unmarked *vis-a-vis* feminine). In his terms, there is 'isomorphism of prosody and grammar, where the former is an icon of the latter' (1986:193). Thus he states that (p.198):

...Russian prosody is a semiotic phenomenon...its explanation (motivation) is to be sought in patterned congruences between prosody and grammar that are semiotic in their essence.

As he sees it, the history of Russian accentuation is the movement away from a phonologically motivated system (in

Common Slavonic) towards a system 'motivated primarily by the grammar' (a similar point is made by Tornow, see above); it is, in other words, a reinterpretation of one system into another. Thus many accentual phenomena of modern Russian cannot be accounted for in terms of one system; indeed it is a distortion to do so, since historical residues from older systems are also present.

**Feinberg** (1987) presents a complex analysis of verbal stress, which argues, in line with much recent work, that 'the accentual system...is motivated by the phonological shape of the suffixes that define its accent' (p.104). A similar approach is found in a recent article by Fedianina (1993), whose morphological classification of verbs is constructed according to the presence or absence of a suffix in the pres/fut and the past of the verb in question, finding that there are correlations between this and the verb's stress pattern. The difference between the organisation, as well as the function of stress, in verbs and in nouns is thus clear: while verbs have different stress patterns according to structural considerations, nouns are organised according to differences of gender, or by the distinguishing of grammatical features, such as the Sg-Pl distinction.

**Kempgen's** (1989) exhaustive examination of Russian verbal morphology works within a traditional structuralist framework, and seeks to do for the verbal system what Zalizniak (1967) does for the nominal system; indeed, his approach to stress is largely informed by Zalizniak's work in this field. Kempgen usefully separates '*Stammbildung*', or the construction of stem forms, from '*Formenbildung*', or the construction of word-forms themselves. With the former are associated '*Akzentverschiebungen*' or 'stress shifts' of a syllabic nature, with reference to the infinitive, for example retraction in the formation of the past passive participle stem; with the latter, '*Akzentbewegungen*' or 'stress movements' of a morphemic nature, with reference to the other forms within that part of the paradigm, for example mobile stress within the past. The two processes are hierarchically ordered, so that the first step in finding a particular form is establishing the correct stem-form

(infinitive, present, past or past passive participle - all forms are considered to derive from one of these four stems) the formation of which may involve certain 'stress shifts', and the second step the adding of suffixes and desinences, incorporating the 'stress movements' that may occur in that part of the paradigm.

Kempgen's detailed data-led analysis of verbs allows him to make generalisations about the connection between patterns of stress and such features as the stem-final element (in particular whether it is consonantal or vocalic), the elimination or preservation of a stem-final vowel and the syllable count, rather than relating stress simply to inflectional type, as is the tendency with Zalizniak; there are no new conclusions about stress, however, which cannot be integrated into Zalizniak's approach. Kempgen's work is commendable chiefly for its rigorously applied separation of stress shifts in stem-formation and stress movements in inflection proper, and the comprehensive nature of the material investigated. He also refers briefly (pp.539-42) to a hearer-centred approach to verbal morphology, the central element of which is the decoding of linearly ordered grammatical information contained in the segments of individual word-forms; this idea is not, however, developed.

A different approach to verbal stress is found in a recent study by **Gladney** (1995), which takes a rule-based morphophonemic approach. The examination is characterised by his particular handling of thematic vowels (eg the -и- in **говори́ть**), which he considers to be accentually irrelevant; stress is not determined by root and thematic vowel combinations (ie stems, inflectional suffixes), but by roots, which are considered to have innate accentual properties (cf Garde), working in combination with the desinences. Even in this approach, however, the stress property of a root morpheme cannot really be considered to be constant, since different rules must be posited which operate on certain roots when they appear in particular inflected forms; only by means of these rules, variously applied, can Gladney explain, for example, the otherwise unpredictable desinence-stress of past f **дра́л**.

An examination of stress from the perspective of 'functional weight' appears in the work of Lehfeldt and Schweier. **Lehfeldt** (1978) introduces a new methodology for the analysis of verbal morphology, which he calls an '*analytisch-synthetisch-funktionelle Beschreibung*'. This, applied to the pres/fut and the past of verbs, consists of identifying three inflectional paradigms (first and second conjugation pres/fut, and the past), four morphological paradigms (according to how the 'Basisform' is changed in the conjugation of the pres/fut), and three stress paradigms (fixed stem, fixed desinence or mobile). He then determines which combinations of these three occur, and how common each combined pattern is, and on the basis of this information, he calculates the functional weight - essentially a mathematical index - of each.

**Schweier** (1993) draws inspiration from Lehfeldt's discussion of verbal stress (Lehfeldt 1978, 1985a), in her calculation of functional weight for nouns. Importantly, she rejects the concept of theoretical stress, as well as the collapsing of animate and inanimate noun patterns into a single scheme (1993:75):

Bei einer rein funktionalen Betrachtung halten wir diese Vereinfachungen für nicht akzeptabel, denn uns geht es ja um die an der Textoberfläche zu analysierende Funktion des beweglichen Akzents beim Ausdruck grammatischer Bedeutungen.

The mathematical calculation of functional weight which follows makes many presumptions which are open to debate, and it is not clear that it represents any great advance on traditional methods of analysis of stress in nouns; it is commendable, however, for its attempt to evaluate the importance of actual stress contrasts between different word-forms. The author finds, from data in Fedianina (1976), that three patterns of stress mobility are favoured in Russian: a Sg-Pl contrast (море, вино), which draws a number distinction by stress; the pattern represented by рыба, which is contrasted with three case-forms (NAGPl); and the pattern of слон or стол, since these contrast a sole form with all

others. Problems in the application of a concept of functional weight appear, however, for the last of these three, which, despite its favoured status, has a low functional weight according to Schweier's calculations.

A very different angle on stress is presented by the metrical analysis proposed in recent articles by **Kodzasov** (1989, and in particular 1994a, 1994b). Kodzasov's approach takes as its basis the discovery of 'hidden (usually unconscious) features of Russian words' (1994b:1), which are the features *accent* (ie stress), *phonation shift* (between modal, creaky and breathy voice), *reduction*, *subsidiary prominence*, and (articulatory) *openness* for which Kodzasov claims to have experimental evidence. Thus, for example, *женá* and *бóбá* (GSg of *бóб*) both have a transition from modal (ie neutral) to creaky voice in the desinence, whilst *вино́* contains a transition from modal to breathy voice in the desinence. The occurrence of such features within a word-form determines the stress of the word-form, and thus the different stress patterns are correlated not to morphological or semantic distinctions, but to these hitherto unidentified prosodic features. Stress is, in this sense, more superficial than other 'prosodic' features of a word-form, and historically secondary. It is, of course, difficult to evaluate Kodzasov's approach without recourse to his experimental data, and it remains to be seen how this new approach will be received generally.

One final work on stress merits detailed discussion here. **Nesset** (1994) is a study of stress in Russian nouns, based on material provided by a series of native speaker tests carried out by the author, both of real and nonsense words. The analysis is rooted in the field of cognitive linguistics, and draws in particular on the model of cognitive morphology proposed by Joan Bybee. Fundamental to the discussion, Nesset proposes 'classifying the relevant paradigms only with regard to that part of the paradigm where the stress falls on another syllable than in the leading [ie initial] form' (p.28). This leads him to distinguish between a noun's 'exponence feature' (ef) – the inflectional cases where stress is in a different place from the initial form

(thus *rórod* and *колбасá* both have Pl as their *ef*) – and a noun's 'stress placement in the exponence feature forms' (*speff*), or the syllable the stress actually falls on in these inflectional cases (*rórod* and *колбасá* thus have different *speff*'s). Nouns sharing an *ef* and having identical *speff*'s belong to the same stress class; Nesset identifies thirteen such classes. He thus hopes to establish the separation between *ef*'s and *speff*'s, stating ultimately that he finds 'no psycholinguistic evidence that specifically shows that *ef* and *speff* are inseparable' (p.117).

Nesset rejects the morphemic approach taken by many writers, because of the difficulty this model has in capturing stem-internal stress movement (eg *кóлос* N/ASg, *колóсья* N/APl, which Nesset treats as belonging to a single paradigm). In its place he takes a syllabic approach, numbering syllables from the beginning or end of the word, that is, the left or right word boundary. He identifies three places of stress (*speff*'s) for nouns with mobile stress: *1l* (first syllable), *2r* (penultimate syllable) and *1r* (final syllable); in dissyllabic word-forms *1l* and *2r* are, of course, the same syllable (called *1l/2r*), and in monosyllabic forms *1l* and *1r* coincide (forming *1l/1r*). Thus *звѣрь* receives the classification *Ef: obl pl*, *speff: 1r*, indicating that the stress is different to that of the NSg in the oblique Pl forms, and that in these cases the stress falls on the first syllable from the right, that is, the final syllable.

Whilst the *ef* - *speff* separation Nesset proposes allows him to establish certain connections between nouns traditionally separated into different stress classes (the phonological similarity between *пукá*, *пекá* and *coxá*, and the fact that they all have 'plural' as their *ef*), other problems arise from this very juxtaposition; thus, for example, *пукá* and *пекá* are categorised three times in all, appearing as *ef:Pl*, *ef:NPl* and *ef:ASg*; the stress variation in *пекá* is not captured at all by Nesset's categorisation.

The results of Nesset's field-work are presented in three central chapters of the work. On the basis of these data, he attempts to establish what it is that predisposes a noun to having a certain *ef* and *speff*, in other words, the

correlation between the shape of the noun and the pattern of stress it displays. His central thesis is that a noun's *ef* is linked to its stem-final consonant, and its *speff* to whether the NSg ends in a consonant or a vowel. In the course of arguing these points, however, he discovers that other information is often of even greater importance in the choice of *ef* and *speff*, such as animacy, the presence of inflectional suffixes, fleeting vowels, the phonological form of the stem, stress placement in the NSg, neutralisation of the 1l-2r opposition, the semantics of the noun, its gender and declension, the absence of Sg forms (for nouns which are *pluralia tantum*), and such like (pp.63-64, 87-88, 113-14). Since all of these factors must be taken into account, Nessel's proposed approach does not seem any more economical, although it may be more psychologically real, than a traditional grouping of words into stress classes.

Nessel's concluding chapter contains a presentation of his ten most important generalisations in a form relatively free of linguistic jargon that he hopes will be 'of help for at least advanced students of Russian' (p.135). Certain truths are grasped in the generalisations; however, whilst five or so are correctly drawn (Generalisations C, E, F, G and J), one is more or less self-evident (Generalisation B), others are incomplete in the information they contain (Generalisations D, H and I), and they are all ultimately weakened by the fact that they still admit of exceptions (in particular Generalisation A). The student user must, of course, additionally know in advance that a word has mobile stress, and that many words which share the phonological features of those covered in the generalisations do not have mobile stress at all.

The problem of competing stress variants arises as a result of the native-speaker tests, and represents a real problem for Nessel's generalisations. In practice, if the data from informant tests show stress variants, he interprets this as the clash of a norm of pronunciation with the rule he has proposed. This convenient handling of problematic data leads him to claim that vacillation in stress supports his



hypotheses, although this begs the unaddressed question of why the norm does not agree with the rule.

Other problematic data are explained by reference to the frequency of the nouns concerned. The idea that the lower the frequency of a noun, the lower the likelihood of it having a particular mobile stress pattern is not new, but here it is linked to the degree to which a noun fulfils the criteria identified by Nesset which would lead a noun to have a certain stress pattern (its 'motivation', see pp.73-4). Any discussion of frequency in relation to stress is beset with problems, however, since frequency dictionaries (Nesset uses Morkovkin 1985) tend not to take account of the relative frequencies of different case-forms of a lexeme.

His interpretation of the data is open to more serious criticism; figures are rarely comparable between tables or even within the same table, making them of limited use to other researchers, and Nesset is apt to dismiss troublesome data on variation without further discussion. The acceptability of data from tests involving nonsense-words will also be questioned by many (see, for example, Hart 1995:388-90), although these results tend to be used in the examination of hypotheses otherwise well supported by data from written sources and tests with real words.

Overall, Nesset's analysis is thus of only limited value, adding rather little to our knowledge of patterns of stress in nouns. His field-work demonstrates that variation is even more widespread than is indicated by the information contained in normative dictionaries, affecting even nouns for which no variation is recorded in sources. Regrettably, the presentation of these new data is sufficiently unclear to prevent its use in studies such as the present one.

## ii) Specific areas of Russian stress

A number of articles shed interesting light on the stress of Russian nouns. Two articles by **Hingley** (1952, 1958) discuss areas of instability in Russian declension and stress; the first (1952) looks at nouns in -а/-я, and discusses both

historical trends and likely future developments. From his examination of the data contained in different dictionaries for nouns in stressed *-á/-ǎ*, Hingley concludes that the two original patterns of fixed desinence-stress (eg *хва́ла*) and mobility of the *рукá*-type (*рукá*, ASg *ру́ку*, N/APl *ру́ки*, DPl *рукáм*) are being replaced by a new mobile pattern with a Sg-Pl stress opposition, exemplified by the noun *грозá* (*грозá*, ASg *грозý*, N/APl *грозы*, DPl *грозам*); many nouns, however, are presently at intermediate stages between the two older and the one new pattern, and a large number of transitional patterns are found. **Jiráček** (1987), taking the information contained in Borunova et al. (1983, the first edition of OS) into account, confirms the movement away from the original mobile pattern of *рукá*; the productive patterns, to which the nouns in question are attracted, are, as in Hingley, that of *грозá* (Sg-Pl opposition), but also that of *ценá* (*ценá*, ASg *це́ну*, N/APl *це́ны*, DPl *це́нам*), the latter assigned 'transitional' status in Hingley.

Hingley (1958) is a rather broader examination of areas of instability in Russian declension, looking not just at stress, but also at morphological variation. He concludes that opposite tendencies are found in morphology (flexion) and in stress; in the former, there is, he believes, an increase in regularity; in the latter, by contrast, he finds an increase in so-called 'irregularity', by which he means word-forms stressed on a different syllable to that stressed in the initial form. The latter conclusion is weakened, however, both by the fragmentary nature of the data he provides and by this idiosyncratic concept of irregularity in stress.

An article by **Mustajoki** (1990) investigates the factors affecting the readiness with which nouns in *-á/-ǎ* level stress in the Sg or Pl sub-paradigm, on the basis of data contained in thirteen dictionaries published between 1935 and 1984. He finds that three factors are of importance: frequency, phonetic shape and semantic considerations. He points out that it is not the frequency of the lexeme as a whole which is significant, but the frequency of occurrence of the particular inflected form whose stress differs from that of

the initial form. In the Sg, the phonetic shape of the end of the stem is also important - of nouns with stem-stress in ASg, only *земля́* has a two-consonant combination in this position; in the Pl, the number of syllables, combined with considerations of frequency, affect the likelihood of a direct-oblique stress contrast: monosyllabic stems with a high frequency of oblique Pl forms, and dissyllabic and trisyllabic stems irrespective of frequency show mobility. Occasionally, semantic considerations are significant, where homomorphous forms may be differentiated by stress alone (*грядá, косá, средá* ).

A brief article by **Worth** (1983) examines the phonological conditions found in the stems of certain masculine nouns, which would seem to predispose them to acquire plurals in *-á/-я́*. He discovers (p.261) that nouns which have developed this Pl type have either true pleophonic stems (eg *бѣрег* ), or stems 'which partially imitate the segmental phonology of pleophonic forms' (eg *тормоз* ), or feature a 'reversal of medial and final consonant classes, as compared to pleophonic forms' (eg *вѣчер, тополь, соболь*, and loan-words *штѣпсель, шомпол* ). For these two latter types he devises the term 'neo- or pseudo-pleophony'.

**Jakobson** dedicates an interesting article (1957) to the relationship between the genitive and nominative cases in nouns, drawing attention to the fact that, with very few exceptions, either the GPl or NSg of a particular noun will have a zero-desinence; this, he believes, points to a historical trend towards a differentiation of the GPl and the NSg. A similar differentiation is seen between the GSg and the NPl, if the nouns feature mobile stress; the two cases may be differentiated by stress alone, eg GSg *губы́*, N/APl *губы́*, GSg *зѣркала*, N/APl *зѣркала́*, or by desinence and stress together. The same tendency is seen in the spread of desinence-stressed masculine Pl forms in *-á/-я́*, all of which contrast with the GSg in unstressed *-а/-я*, eg *кондѹктор*, GSg *кондѹктора*, NPl *кондукторá*. He concludes that evidence from historical changes confirms that there is a tendency not just to differentiate the two forms by the place of the stress, but towards 'confining the difference between the forms...to a mere stress alternation'

(p.139). This tendency is also seen in the distinguishing of LSg from PSg (eg LSg **тѣни́**, PSg **тѣни** ), and LSg from partitive GSg (eg LSg **лѣсѹ́**, partitive GSg **лѣсу** ); the same tendency is found in Serbo-Croat and Slovak.

An article by **Dingley** (1989) examines innovation in the stress patterns of third declension (-i-) nouns. He believes, following Bulakhovskii (1954:162) and Kiparsky (1962) that innovation in the stress pattern of the Sg is linked to the existence of a second prepositional form (henceforth locative, LSg) (1989:5), and that combinations of prepositions and nouns are 'an essential bridge' in this process (p.8). He argues for the recognition of two new stress patterns for such nouns (pp.5-6): the first of these (his PAT 6) has desinence-stress in the Sg (forms such as **свѣзѣю** he assigns desinence-stress at the morphophonemic level) and stem-stress in the plural; and example of this pattern is **свѣзь**. The second (his PAT 7) has desinence-stress for the oblique Pl as well as the Sg; an example is **стѣнь** (again, **стѣнью** is considered to have desinence-stress). The innovation which he identifies for these nouns is the occurrence of desinence-stress in the Sg (p.6).

He examines all third declension nouns, with or without a locative form, drawing on the changing information contained in A&O (1960) and OS (1983). For those without a locative form, no innovation in the Sg is recorded (p.6). Twelve of the twenty-nine nouns listed in Strichak (1966:102) as having a locative form show a clear progression towards his new patterns when information in the two dictionaries is compared. He argues that desinence-stress for the locative (after **на, в**) spreads to desinence-stress after prepositions requiring G, D and P (eg **с, по, о**), and hence desinence-stress is generalised for these cases even without prepositions. He further contends that, in fact, desinence-stress for these forms may be 'the continuation of older stress patterns, which, contrary to the normative handbooks...simply did not die out' (p.11). In particular, it seems that they are typical of some southern dialects.

Dingley links the changes found in these nouns to the rise of an ~~an~~ ASg-Pl contrast in nouns in -ѣ/-ѧ (such as **блѣхѣ**),

and views the pattern of stem-stress in the direct Pl and desinence-stress in the oblique Pl as simply an intermediate stage for nouns moving towards a full Sg-Pl contrast (this follows Hingley 1952:198 and Kiparsky 1962:229-32). This contrasts with Tornow's view that desinence-stressed DSg forms are a relic only (1984:233-35). Dingley also examines toponyms in this light, but finds that they provide very little extra evidence for his contention (p.15).

**Es'kova** (1989) suggests that there is a correlation between potential forms with a zero-desinence, where stress is, as it were, forced to move one syllable left (eg adjS m forms where other adjS forms all have desinence-stress, the GPl of nouns in -а and -о with desinence-stress in the Pl, and such like) and the non-existence of such forms, or their 'doubtful' nature. There would appear to be some grounds for her thesis - she gives examples such as *письмецо́*, GPl *письме́ц* (a questionable form), *кочерá*, GPl *кочерёг* (again, formed with difficulty), *мечта́*, GPl conventionally suppletive *мечта́ний*, *больн-ой*, with short forms *больна́*, -ó, -ы but anomalous *бо́лен*, *голубо́й* which lacks an adjS m form - but there are, of course, a great number of counter-examples where the zero-desinence forms present no such difficulty.

Two works not previously mentioned contain information pertinent to the retraction of stress onto the preposition in preposition + nouns phrases. **Isachenko's** seminal study of Russian morphology (Isachenko, 1962) looks at retraction of stress onto prepositions before both nouns and numerals.

Such combinations tend towards adverbial or idiomatic use, whilst analogous constructions not retracting the stress are used to express 'free syntactic relationships' (p.106). Thus a contrast is set up between the retracted *испуга́ться до́ смерти*, and the unretracted *о́н до сме́рти про́жил в э́том го́роде*. Isachenko states that the retraction of stress onto prepositions is to a great extent lexicalized; in addition, many retractions are written as one word, eg *бе́столку*, *до́низу* (p.107).

Isachenko gives full lists of all such combinations and their possible idiomatic contexts and meanings (pp.106-8 masculine nouns, p.112 neuter nouns, pp.119-20 feminine nouns, pp.123-24 third declension feminine nouns, pp.536-37 numerals). Combinations which show retraction are variously described as being used 'adverbially' (eg *жить за городом, под вечер*) 'half-adverbially' (eg *выйти на берег*), or 'in idioms/set-phrases' (eg *бросать слова на ветер*); in 'free syntactic combinations' retraction does not occur (eg *смотреть на берег*) (p.106).

Isachenko follows Shakhmatov in stating that this phenomenon is caused historically by the retraction in Common Slavonic (*Urslav.*) of a falling tone onto the first syllable of the noun, or any preceding proclitic. The falling tone of the words involved in this process (with the exception of the borrowed *бóрт*) can be established by their pleophonic roots, or by comparison with their Slovenian cognates, which preserve the falling tone. The same process is at work in the retraction of stress onto prepositions preceding certain numerals (eg *за сорок, по три*), and the retraction of stress onto a preceding adjective observed in the *byliny* (eg *чистó поле, синё море, на белú снегу*) (pp.107-8).

Retraction of stress occurs with the numerals *два́, двé, три́, сóрок* and *сто́*, primarily when the following numerals occur phrase-finally ('*absolut gebraucht werden*', eg *считáть до́ ста*), but also sometimes when the numerals are followed by a noun (eg *он дава́л ка́ждому по́ две копе́йки*). The latter type of combination can no longer be seen as 'free grammatical combinations' ('*freie grammatische Fügungen*'), since retraction may or may not occur - both variants are correct - and indeed retraction is clearly dying out (pp.526-27). In his discussion of numeral inversion (p.536), Isachenko gives the example *челове́к на́ сто* 'for about a hundred people', indicating that retraction may also co-occur with inversion; this phenomenon is not further discussed, however.

A short article by **Muzychenko** (1971) points out that this process of *энклиза* or 'encliticisation' of nouns generally only occurs where the nouns have monosyllabic stems (eg *водá*) or pleophonic stems (*бе́рег*) and mobile stress, or

have roots containing fleeting vowels (eg *дѣнь*); only a few nouns do not fit this pattern (eg *двѣр*, *вѣчер*, *пѣлдень*, *пѣлnochь*, *пѣяс*). Moreover, in order for the stress to be retracted, it would have otherwise to fall on the first syllable of the noun (p.66).

Many words fulfilling these criteria, however, do not display stress retraction; these, Muzychenko states (p.66), are primarily words whose mobile stress is a new phenomenon (eg *дѣло*, *мѣсто*) and borrowed words, which, with the exception of *бѣрт*, do not show retraction.

The commonest prepositions involved in this process, and their meanings he considers to be as follows: *на* + A, with a spatial or temporal meaning; *на* + P with a spatial meaning; *за* + A with a temporal or spatial meaning; *за* + I with a spatial meaning; *по* + D with a spatial meaning; *по* + A with a spatial meaning, although this is less stable; and combinations involving *под*, *из* and *об*. Some combinations are adverbialised (eg *пѣ боку*), but the combination may also occur in a non-adverbialised sense without stress retraction (eg *ударить пѣ боку*); on other occasions, retraction of stress only occurs in set-phrases (eg *сѣ свету сжить*). The prepositions *на*, *за*, *до* and *по* occur most frequently in fixed phrases with stress retraction, and these prepositions are also the most common in free combinations where retraction may occur (p.68).

He goes on to state that variation in stress retraction, however, is found even in the oldest texts (p.67). The phenomenon of retraction of stress onto the preposition as a whole further appears to be losing ground in modern Russian, under the influence of the many fixed-stress nouns, and a reduction in mobile stress generally (pp.67-8).

We turn now to the stress of the past and pppS of verbs, reflexive and non-reflexive. This has often been considered along with the stress patterns found in the adjS, and we include here articles referring to this topic also.

**Ulukhanov** (1991) examines the retraction of stress onto the prefix in the past and the pppS of some verbs, attempting to determine the motivating factors. For one group of verbs

(знáть, пнáть, спáть, брáть, врáть, дрáть, ждáть, жрáть, звáть, лгáть, рвáть, слáть, стлáть, ткáть, пнúть, ткнúть), their inflectional class (-áть, -нúть) and the fact of their monosyllabic stem in unprefixated past forms would seem to determine regular prefix stressing in pppS. A second group, however, (бýть, бíть, дáть, жítъ, клáсть, пítъ, -мерéть, -нáть, -перéть, -чáть), do not share morphophonological features which predetermine their membership of this class, except the monosyllabicity of their stems in the past (other verbs, such as шítъ, also have this feature but do not retract stress); retraction is irregular and occurs, with certain prefixes, in both the past and the pppS (except f forms).

For the first group, Ulukhanov believes that stress retraction should be seen as a movement of the stress one syllable to the left, irrespective of morphemic considerations; with the second group, it is precisely the *prefix* morpheme which becomes stressed. This hypothesis is confirmed by forms such as переб́ранный, where stress has been retracted by one syllable, in contrast to пéредал, недóдал, where it is clearly the first syllable of the prefix morpheme which is stressed. Thus, membership of the first group is determined by accentological, morphophonological, inflectional and morphological factors; the members of the second group must be simply listed. The hypothesis appears to be based on the data as presented in Zal., and is thus subject to verification in the light of more recent surveys of the language. It does not explain, or seek to explain, the phenomenon of stress mobility in the past tense word-forms of all these verbs.

**Ostrogorskaia-Iakshich** (1987) examines the range of permissible stress forms in the past tense word-forms of reflexive and non-reflexive verbs, taking a strongly normative line. Basing her examination on data from various dictionaries (the most recent of which, regrettably, dates only from 1977 - Zal.), she makes the neat point that, whilst prefixes attract the stress in the past of some verbs, the reverse process is found in their reflexive counterparts, in which the reflexive particle attracts the stress, eg нáчал - началс́я, пр́инял - приня́лся. The insight is flawed, however, by



the existence of the forms *начался, принялсЯ*, which, although non-normative, are very common. She also, correctly, points out that prefix-stress is never found in the past of reflexive verbs correlating with non-reflexive verbs which have mobile stress in the past, but that desinence-stress is general in the past f, nt and pl; additionally, stress on the reflexive particle is normative for *началсЯ, отперсЯ, заперсЯ, занялсЯ, принялсЯ* and *нанялсЯ*.

An article by **Lehfelddt** (1987) concerns itself with changes in stress norms for the past of prefixed verbs with mobile stress and the adjS, comparing information from A&O (1959) with that of Borunova et al. (first edition of OS, 1983), and taking account of descriptions published between these two dates (eg Zal.; Gorbachevich, 1971, 1978). For the adjS, he notes a strong movement away from mobile stress (desinence-stress in the adjS f) towards fixed stem-stress, a weaker movement from mobile to fixed desinence-stress, and the development of a new mobile pattern of desinence-stress in the adjS f and pl, besides stem-stress in the adjS m and nt (as a variant for adjectives already featuring traditional mobile stress, rather than as an independent pattern); a few adjS formerly showing variation between fixed desinence-stress and traditional mobile stress have also acquired this new mobile pattern. Of the hundred or so adjectives which were recorded in A&O with traditional mobile stress, only two appear without possible variants or displaying a change of stress pattern in Borunova et al. (1983).

Lehfelddt considers changes in the stress of past forms of prefixed verbs with mobile stress to be less dramatic. Stem-stress has replaced prefix-stress as the norm for the past m, nt, pl for many verbs, but prefix-stress remains as a variant (eg *прижйл* alongside permissible, older *прижйл*); contrary to this, for a few verbs stem-stress remains a feature of non-standard speech (eg standard *бжил*, but non-standard *ожйл*). No account is given, however, of the possibility of desinence-stress in the past nt, already well established for many younger speakers (see below, Chapter 5).

Two articles by **A. V. Shapiro** discuss the stress of the pppS (1948) and the adjS (1952). In the latter article,

he establishes rules for the stress of the adjS m and adjS f which concern the form of the stem (the number of syllables, the presence or absence of particular suffixes, and such like), and then draws on evidence from poetry from the 1920s to the 1950s to examine variation in the adjS nt and pl. He gives the number of occurrences of each adjS form in the corpus of poetry he has examined, on which basis the approximate relative frequency of the forms appears to be, in our calculation, as follows (see 1952:101 for Shapiro's more approximate figures):

adjS m	7%
adjS pl	7%
adjS nt	38%
adjS f	48%

The existence of newer, desinence-stressed adjS nt and adjS pl variants can now be put down to the influence of the more frequent desinence-stressed adjS f; however, this fails to explain why desinence-stressed variants gained particular popularity in the second quarter of the twentieth century. This phenomenon Shapiro explains by the loss of the "усечённые прилагательные", that is, the apocopated adjective forms as in *мра́чна но́чь*, contrasting with adjS f *мрачнá* (see Vlasto 1988:117); these were generally stem-stressed and, he believes, influenced the adjS forms by analogy. However, Shapiro believes the main reason that desinence-stressed adjS pl forms are developing is that they are subject to the same trend as is found in the new NPl forms in *ы́/и́* or *а́/я́* of many masculine nouns ending in a consonant, eg the new Pl forms *балы́, лесá*.

A short article by **Ferrel** (1956) treats adjectives which are formally differentiated in some way from the participles from which they arise, a subject also touched on, but examined in less detail, by Simmons (1966). Ferrel enumerates some fifteen types of differentiation, some of which involve distinction by stress; however, for only a handful of examples is this the sole distinguishing feature, eg *прррL вй́тый, завй́тый, лй́тый, зánятый, зáпертый* contrasting with

adjL **вИтО́й, заВИтО́й, лИтО́й, занЯтО́й, запертО́й**. Where stress is used contrastively, he concludes that 'the accent of the adjectives is rarely more recessive than that of the participles' (p.150).

The same topic is treated in an exhaustive manner by **Fougères** (1974, henceforth Foug.), who argues that the process of adjectivalisation of past passive participles takes place in three stages. These she describes as follows (p.162):

...(1) the participial forms have been partially adjectivized and function both as adjective and participle; (2) the participial forms have been adjectivized but still possess a differentiated correlative participle, and (3) the participial forms have undergone complete adjectivization and lack a correlative participle existing in Modern Russian.

Items at her stage (2) sometimes show a secondary differentiation by stress of the pppL from the adjL. Foug. gives all the examples which she has identified in the *Slovar' russkogo iazyka* (1957-61). These can be divided into different types as follows (this is a summary of the relevant parts of Foug.):

(i) those differentiated by stress only:

- with no resulting vowel change eg **про́клятый** pppL, versus **прокля́тый** adjL;
- with an 'automatic' change in desinence vowel in adjL m, eg **зави́тый** pppL, **завитО́й** adjL;
- with an 'automatic' change in stem vowel, eg **пекле́ванный** pppL, versus **пеклевáнный** adjL;

(ii) those differentiated by stress and by suffix vowel (vowel change is not considered automatic by Foug.), eg **сло́женный** pppL, versus **сложённый** adjL.

Other forms of differentiation occur, such as by suffix consonant(s), eg *дёржанный* pppL, versus *дёржанный* adjL; it should also be noted that the *е > ё* mutation is not <sup>always</sup> considered to be automatic, since the language provides examples of pairs differing only in this vowel, eg *совершённый* pppL (East Slavonic in origin) versus *совершённый* adjL, a borrowing from Church Slavonic.

With contrasts of stress and desinence vowel in the adjL m, Foug. notes (p.37) that generally the adjL is stressed on the desinence, and the pppL on a different syllable, usually that of the infinitive (except *на́литый* and *про́питый*, both of which have stress variants in the pppL as marked). *Прокля́тый* is an exception to this, with prefix-stress in the pppL, and stem-stress in the adjL.

The stem vowel, as well as stress, is contrasted in only one example, according to Foug. (p.37): here, the adjL *пеклева́нный* is stressed one syllable further right than its corresponding pppL *пекле́ванный*.

When it is the suffix vowel that is contrasted, the pppL is stressed in accordance with the patterns described below (see Chapter 3); the adjective which corresponds to it is stressed one syllable further right. Foug. writes that (p.38):

...we can assume that the adjective's position of stress has been shifted to a syllable other than the one under stress in the correlative participle in order to facilitate a differentiation between the adjective and its correlative participle both of which would be otherwise identical. In all cases the stress has been shifted...in the adjective.

In total, Foug. identifies around 125 examples of adjectivalised pppL forms contrasting with pppL forms by various means (p.36), and four further examples where variants may form such a contrast. Those providing identical word-forms which may be differentiated by stress alone when written are listed in Chapter 3, and were investigated as part of the present study.

### iii) Works with a pedagogical aim

Pedagogical works on stress generally do no more than, at best, reflect the advances made in theory contained in more analytical works, in a form more easily digested by students of the language. Some also contain useful lists of words. The following notes cover only the more important or influential works which have come to our notice.

**Sieff's** (1919) '*Practical Guide to the Russian Accent*' has a pedagogical aim, and is in fact little more than a translation of Bystrow's work of thirty-five years before. Its strength, however, is in its word reference section, which contains some 4,000 words, each marked according to its stress category, and accompanied by a reference to the page on which it is mentioned.

**Forsyth's** book (1963) is a practical guide, aiming to facilitate the learning of stress patterns and tendencies by the foreign language speaker, rather than an attempt to deal with theories of stress mobility.

**Strichek** (1966) finds, in what is essentially a handbook for students of Russian, no less than twenty basic stress patterns in nouns, four for the adjS and five for the past of verbs. Whilst the information contained is extremely detailed - the work examines an enormous number of less common words as well as those more frequently used and covers all parts of speech (he includes a discussion of the pppS, an area neglected by many others) - little attempt is made to rationalise this information.

Work from America from the late 60s and 70s reflects the dominance of the morphophonemic approach, as developed by Jakobson (see Jakobson 1948, introducing the single-stem approach to Russian verbs). The application of this type of system to the teaching of students is seen in works such as **Lipson** (1968) and **Townsend** (1970), which use a set of diacritics added to base-forms to indicate the stress behaviour of lexical items. Articles by **Levin** (1977) and **Steele** (1977) essentially offer titivations of these systems. This approach, however, particularly in its pedagogical application, can be criticised for the level of

abstraction it contains; students may resist learning abstract, 'underlying' forms, which do not necessarily bear much relation to the actual forms found in the language, as well as a set of diacritics, before they can construct the actual forms found in the language. Levin, in a later article (Levin 1986) examines the stress of reflexive verbs in the past from a pedagogical standpoint, but adds nothing new to our understanding of this area.

**Schütz**'s recent stress-handbook (1987) is a purely pedagogical work, and introduces no new thinking on stress; his system is largely inspired by Red., and ignores much of the true complexity of the system.

#### iv) Historical accentology, other Slavonic languages

Work in historical accentology has, until recently, run in parallel with work on the stress of modern Russian, the two remaining rather separate fields. The potential contribution of historical work to modern stress studies is enormous, however, and the harmonisation of the diachronic and synchronic approaches of the type found, for example, in Stankiewicz (1993, see below), is to be welcomed. The limited discussion which follows seeks to give no more than an outline of some of the more important historical work from this century.

**Sobolevskii**'s '*Lektsii po istorii russkogo iazyka*' (1907, reprinted 1962) is concerned with the history of the Russian language, and contains a chapter on stress. The account lacks detail, however, and does little to elucidate our understanding of stress in the modern language.

**Shakhmatov** (1941, 4th ed.; written 1911-12) contains what seems to be the first mention of the fact that masculine nouns which are desinence-stressed have a concrete meaning, with few exceptions (nouns in -*эж*, *ег грабѣж*, *мятѣж*). The idea is not pursued, however.

**Nachtigall** (1922) gives a good account of the historical developments which have created Russian stress patterns. In so doing, he examines modern stress thoroughly,

covering just under 2,000 words, and giving full consideration to such factors as the desinence of words, foreign words, prefixed forms, fleeting *o/e*, and so on. He also considers the adverbial use of nouns in the instrumental, predominantly with desinence-stress (eg *бегóм*). Desinence-stress can be used to distinguish a secondary adverbial meaning from a more direct meaning, as in *кругóм* 'around' versus *крьúгом* 'in a circle', *верхóм* 'on horseback' versus *вёрхом* 'to the top' (as in *крьúжка вёрхом полна́*). He also examines the importance of rhythm and rhyme in idioms; a modern example of this is seen in *не всякое лы́ко в стрóку* 'one mustn't be too fussy, one must make allowances'.

**Kurylowicz's** seminal work on Indo-European stress (Kurylowicz 1952) makes significant advances in this field. A chapter dealing with the Balto-Slav language family includes a discussion of nominal and verbal inflection, but contains few details relevant to the present study. **Bulakhovskii** (1954) examines specifically the Russian literary language of the first half of the nineteenth century. Amongst other points, he points to the influence of northern Russian dialects, and to the increased commonness in this period of stress retraction onto the preposition in preposition + noun phrases.

**Stang** (1957) reconstructs Proto-Slavonic accentuation by the historical-comparative method, rejecting the approaches of de Saussure and van Wijk, and certain elements of Kurylowicz's approach. His work also contains a clear explanation of intonation, and its effect on Russian and Slovene.

**Sheliuto** (1962) is primarily concerned with demonstrating the influence of Ukrainian, Belorussian and northern and southern Russian dialects on the norms of Russian stress. His classification of the stress paradigms of nouns, pronouns and adjectives shows no advance on previously suggested systems, and there are some strange omissions, such as the synthetic forms of the comparative and superlative of adjectives. In contrast, his examination of the adjS is very detailed, with many examples from poetry, and comparisons with related languages and dialects; his aim is to give

historical explanations for forms, however, rather than deal with them synchronically.

**Kiparsky's** (1962, henceforth Kip.) approach is mainly historical, and his work is chiefly significant in terms of its new analysis of much material from the eighteenth century; it is also interesting, however, for its theory and classification of stress patterns in modern Russian, and these will be examined below.

Kip.'s approach is, as has been mentioned, a historical one, relating the modern system of stress to an original historical three-way differentiation wherever possible. He thus aims for efficient classification whilst reflecting historical reality, explaining exceptions in historical terms.

An example of this approach is the treatment of the verbal system which appears in his work. Kip. divides verbs into five classes, following Leskien's (1914) scheme for Serbo-Croat. A three-way classification of all their forms (finite and infinite, participles and gerunds included) is then imposed onto this: that of stem-stress (S), desinence-stress (E) and mobile stress (W). This classification is derived from Bräuer (1949). In his analysis, therefore, Kiparsky may state that verbs of Class 1 belong predominantly to an E-type pattern, whilst verbs of Class 3 rarely belong to this pattern - '*...warum es so ist, wissen wir nicht*'. Exceptions to the patterns and irregularities which occur within them, for example in the past passive participle, are explained in comparative Slavonic and historical terms, and are often seen as the result of the emergence of a secondary stress pattern, diverging from a historical form that fits the pattern.

Kip.'s treatment of nouns first divides these into monosyllabic and polysyllabic nouns. This avoids the necessity of positing a retracted desinence-stress for words such as *стол*, as was done implicitly by many writers before, and explicitly by many since. Monosyllables and polysyllables ending in a consonant in NSg are divided into five types, numbered 1 to 5; polysyllables ending in *а/я* are separated, as are those ending in *о/е*. Nouns ending in *а/я* in NSg are



divided into types I, II, III, A, B and W, and those in o/e into I, II, III and IV. Allowing for identity of stress types (although Kiparsky himself does not draw attention to the fact that several of his classes are collapsible) there are a total of eleven different types. He also includes a detailed discussion of the historical movement in monosyllabic nouns from one stress paradigm to another, drawing on his earlier work in this field (Kiparsky 1950).

His analysis of short-form adjectives again uses the S, E, W distinction. The W pattern (stem-stressed in the adjS m, nt and pl, desinence-stressed in the adjS f eg *мо́лод, мо́лода́, мо́лодо, мо́лоды*) is the most productive, he writes, and attracts adjectives traditionally belonging to other classes; some of these are examined in detail. AdjS with variant stresses (eg *бе́ло́*) are discussed in detail from a historical point of view.

**Vorontsova** (1979) is a part diachronic, part synchronic study. In contrast to other writers, she uses terms such as *баритонированная акцентуационная парадигма* and *окситонированная акцентуационная парадигма* (referring to fixed stem- or desinence-stressed patterns) in her analysis of the system of modern Russian stress, as well as in her historical interpretation. She reaches the conclusion that the overall tendency in nouns is towards mobility and in verbs towards immobility. This is partly due, she argues, to the comparative rarity of phonemic alternation (*очередование фонем*) in nouns, whilst in verbs this is very common. In other words, since distinction at a phonemic level is not an option for nouns, stress mobility is used to make contrasts; verbs, on the other hand, generally show the opposite tendency (1979:24): "...выключить ударение из числа продуктивных глагольных различий."

This is, however, an overall tendency; Vorontsova admits that in some groups of verbs, such as the -ить verbs, just the opposite can be seen. She goes on to examine the historical data in detail, and also looks at contemporary statistical studies, covering in total around 2,500 words. The conclusion reached is one which does not differ from that of most other writers on this subject; it is expressed as follows (p.286):

Принцип грамматической целесообразности, постепенно формирующийся в языке, является, несомненно, основным ориентиром в сложном и неустойчивом состоянии современного ударения,...

**Garde's** contribution to the synchronic study of stress (Garde, 1965, 1978, 1980) has already been discussed; his work in the field of historical accentology, as displayed in his exhaustive, two-volume study of the Slavonic situation (Garde, 1976), is also of great importance, integrating the morpheme valency theory underpinning his work on modern Russian inflection and derivation (see above) into a historical framework. Garde has also written (1974), somewhat less satisfactorily, on two of what he considers the principal tendencies in modern Russian stress: the reduction of 'old' mobility, that is, mobility of the marginal type, as seen in *голова́ - на́ голову*; and the development of pre-desinential and pre-suffixal stress. The first tendency can be seen, he argues, in variants such as *собра́л* replacing older *сѡбрал*, and *борозду́* ASg replacing *бѡрозду*; there is strong counter-evidence in the masculine Pl forms in *-á* however (eg *па́спорт - паспортá*). The second tendency he sees in the increase of pres/fut mobility of verbs in *-ить*, variants such as *высо́кѡ* for *высо́кѡ*, and modern *ге́олог* for former *геоло́г*. Although the evidence presented is not as entirely convincing as Garde would have us believe, his two tendencies do neatly account for the coexistence of the variants *ко́ротко - коротко́ - корѡтко*, the second variant listed indicating a change in line with the first tendency (cf *коротка́*), the third a subsequent change in line with the second tendency.

A key work on Slavonic historical accentology, which offers a reconstruction of proto-Slavonic stress paradigms, taking into account recent research in this field, is **Dybo's** *Slavianskaia aktsentologija* (Dybo 1981; see also Lehfeldt (1983) for a discussion of this work, and Lehfeldt (1992) for an excellent up-to-date report on work in the field, with full bibliography). Dybo is also involved in research aiming to reconstruct the stress of the entire proto-Slavonic lexical and morphemic inventory; the first part of this

research, relating to non-derived masculine stems, appears in Dybo, Zamiatina & Nikolaev (1993).

A useful comparative Slavonic work is **Carlton's** *Introduction to the phonological history of the Slavic Languages* (1991), which, in the description of Russian (pp.199ff.) makes the important point that stress variants (doublets, or even triplets) may well have existed in early stages of Common Slavonic.

Some articles by **Stankiewicz** have been discussed above. His recent monograph *The Accentual Patterns of the Slavic Languages* (1993) is to be welcomed for its attempt to combine his understanding of historical accentology with a synchronic description of the Slavonic languages which have free, mobile stress, ie Bulgarian, Serbo-Croat, Slovene, Russian, Belorussian and Ukrainian, as well as the West Slavonic Slovincian, a now extinct dialect of Kashubian. He dedicates a chapter to the description of the stress systems of each of these languages, and concludes with a chapter on the development of Slavonic mobile stress patterns, which cannot be discussed in detail here.

The chapter on Russian offers a broad characterisation of stress in this language, determining patterns of stress and their historical origins, rather than giving a detailed examination of individual items such as that found in Kiparsky; indeed, he criticises Kiparsky for taking this approach (1993:186). Basic to his treatment of stress patterns is his separation of so-called 'automatic alternations', that is mobility arising where there is a zero-morpheme, from 'grammatical alternations', that is mobility such as that between the Sg and Pl in nouns, or direct and oblique cases in the Pl of nouns (see pp.187-88).

Despite its broad nature, his discussion includes several points relevant to the present study, concerning the particulars of stress patterns found in certain word-classes, and especially his comments on innovating tendencies in the colloquial language. Thus he states that the need to distinguish the adverb from the adjS nt has led to 'an additional, though peripheral pattern' of stem-stress in the adverb, eg **крѣнко**, contrasting with desinence-stress in the

adjS nt, eg крепко́. He further points out that a desinence-stressed adjS pl variant is not allowed in (prefixed) negated forms, eg невесе́лы, неста́ры, некре́пки, despite possible веселы́, стары́, крепки́ (p.202). Likewise some comparative forms relating to short adjectives with mobile stress have stem-stressed (prefixed) negative forms, although their non-prefixed forms share the desinence-stress of the adjS f, eg невку́снее, нескро́мнее, нестро́йнее, despite вкусна́ - вкусне́е, скромна́ - скромне́е, стро́йна - стро́йнее (p.204).

Discussing verbs, he notes the tendency, especially in colloquial speech (and in many dialects), to stress the root rather than the prefix in the past of some verbs, eg нали́л, to generalise stem-stress in the past f, eg по́няла, на́чала, and to allow desinence-stress in the past nt, eg далó, рвалó, пробралó. Concerning the last phenomenon, he writes that (p.219):

Since the latter forms are used mainly in impersonal constructions (as in рвалó всю́ но́чь), we may assume that they owe their stress to analogy with the corresponding reflexive forms which they resemble in their syntactic function.

He further notices that root- or prefix-stress tends to be generalised for the pppS f in forms such as отпи́та, по́днята (replacing desinence-stressed forms); some pppS nt word-forms also demonstrate desinence-stressed variants, eg пережитó (p.221). The past forms of reflexive verbs may also, colloquially, be stressed as their non-reflexive counterparts, eg по́днялся, за́перся (p.220).

**Lagerberg** (1992) deals, in a most thorough way, with stress in affixation from a diachronic standpoint; Zalizniak's views are accepted as the strongest to date, his theory of stress in derivation being generally supported by Lagerberg's research into stress in affixation in Russian since the eighteenth century. Stress in word-derivation is also discussed in **Berger** (1990), who compares the different function of stress in inflectional and agglutinating languages. He follows Garde in assigning particular properties or valencies to morphemes in Russian, and concludes that the factors at work in Russian derivational

processes, such as the existence of dominant suffixes, are in fact more typical of an agglutinating language.

It is interesting to compare the situation in Russian with that of related languages, and, to that end, a brief examination of these is included here.

Mobile stress is a feature of **Bulgarian**, (see Tilkov & Boiadzhiev, 1978); mobility is seen in nouns, for example, in the definite form (with postposed definite article) of some masculine and feminine nouns (eg *сѡл - солѡ*), the Pl of some masculine and neuter nouns (eg *сѣло - селѡ*), and the vocative form of some masculine and feminine nouns (*отѣц - ѡтче*).

Zilyns'kyi (1979) reports that great variation in stress is found in **Ukrainian**, according to dialect, with some western regions having the fixed stress on the penultimate syllable characteristic of Polish, and there being a great difference between the traditional standard western and eastern pronunciations. It also appears that the distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables is not as great as in Russian, with consequent vowel reduction less extreme.

An interesting parallel with Russian is found in the stress system of **Belorussian** (as reported in Smuřkowa, 1978). There is great variation in stress, but it appears that (p.155):

...the principal developmental tendencies of Belorussian accentuation...consist mainly in the morphological stabilization of stress and the polarization of the opposition of number at the cost of that of case.'

This view is confirmed in the comparative study of East Slavonic languages carried out by Neweklowsky (1972).

This latter author, writing on tendencies in the development of mobile stress in nouns in Slavonic languages (Neweklowsky 1982) reports that **Serbo-Croat**, like Russian, features older case oppositions by stress; it is also developing a Sg-Pl contrast similar to that found in Russian. Differences arise mainly in the distribution of particular patterns amongst roots, and, of course, in the fact that Serbo-Croat also uses tone distinctively (vowel quantity

oppositions, which also exist, are more or less predictable). In **Slovenian** there are case-distinctions by stress, but no Sg-Pl opposition (Neweklowsky does not consider the dual); a pattern of fixed root-stress is increasing, and generally stress mobility is highly predictable on the basis of inflectional type, the number of syllables, and the tone and quality of the stressed vowel; each noun declension features a single stress pattern, and there are thus no particular problems for learners (p.75).

#### v) Previous surveys of Russian stress

Since the late 1950's a number of language surveys have been carried out in Russia which have examined stress variation, either as their exclusive area of research, or as part of a larger socio-linguistic survey. The chief of these are reported in Superanskaia (1959), Pirogova (1967), Kolesov (1967), Gorbachevich (1971, 1972, 1974, 1978), and Krysin (1973, 1974), the last of these containing the results of the major survey described in Panov's *Russkii iazyk i sovetskoe obshchestvo*, (Panov, 1968). The most important findings of these surveys are summarised in Comrie & Stone (1978:56-69; & Polinsky 1996:71-98) as follows:

1) a movement of words away from the **водá**-type (ASg **вóду**), to desinence-stress throughout the Sg, eg **избá**, ASg **избу́**, formerly **йзбу**;

2) a levelling in the Pl of nouns, eg the oblique Pl of **водá** now stem-stressed like the direct Pl (**вóды**, **вóд**, **вóдам**, **вóдами**, **вóдах**), where formerly desinence-stressed (**водáм**, **водáми**, **водáх**);

3) a general tendency for stress alternation to be lost as a marker of case difference, eg **водá** in the Pl (see above), and a weaker tendency for it to be extended as a marker of number difference, eg the spread of NPl forms in **-á** for masculine nouns;

4) a tendency away from preposition stress in preposition + noun constructions, ie a reversal of the nineteenth-century trend noted by Bulakhovskii (1954);

5) a tendency for stress on verbal prefixes to be replaced by stress on the root of the verb, especially if the meaning of the verb is literally that of the prefix plus the root, eg *отда́л*, traditionally stressed *о́тдал*;

6) an increase in the number of 2nd conjugation verbs in -и́ть showing stress mobility in the pres/fut, eg *да́рить*, *дружи́ть*, both noted by Grot as having fixed stress, but now usually regarded as mobile;

7) a tendency away from the stressing of the reflexive particle in the past m of certain verbs, eg *роди́лся*, *взя́лся*, *обня́лся*, now usually *роди́лся*, *взя́лся*, *обня́лся*;

8) an increase in variation between the traditionally identical stress of the adjS nt and the adjS pl, eg *во́льно* - *во́льны*, now also *вольны́*; an increase in stem-stress in the adjS f, eg *склонна́* is normative, but *скло́нна* has become common.

**Krysin** (1974), reporting the *Russkii iazyk i sovetskoe obshchestvo* survey, also comments on several other areas relevant to the present study. He believes that the number of feminine nouns in -ь with a locative form distinguished from the PSg by stress only (eg LSg *в степи́* versus PSg *сте́пи*) is decreasing, because of the absence of grammatical significance in such a contrast; the two forms are already distinguished by the presence or absence of the preposition *в* or *на*, in itself indicating the locative meaning; this is reflected in the language by the coexistence of forms such as *в степи́* beside *сте́пи*. As a general tendency, mobility is being lost in verbs, and this can be clearly seen in the past of prefixed reflexive verbs, which are developing stem-stress in place of earlier desinence-stress, eg *собра́лись* replacing

собра́лись, and созда́лось replacing созда́лось. It is also seen in the unification of stress in the non-reflexive past, transforming the past f, eg (prefix-stress replacing former desinence-stress) на́чала, до́была, по́дала, о́жила, (stress on the root replacing desinence-stress) спа́ла, бра́ла, добы́ла, пода́ла, ожи́ла, or affecting the past nt and pl, eg (desinence-stress replacing former stem-stress) подало́, придало́, издало́, ожило́, прокляло́; such variants, however, are characterised as non-normative (1974:228).

The *Russkii iazyk i sovetskoe obshchestvo* survey, begun in 1959, and distributed between 1963 and 1966, can be criticised on several scores. It was, as have been most other surveys of Russian stress, a written questionnaire, with the concomitant problems of incorrect self-reporting; moreover, it investigated many areas besides stress, and rather few word-forms were tested - eleven noun word-forms and nineteen verbal word-forms. Its strength, however, is in the number of people surveyed - from 2,000 to 4,500 speakers. The chief factors affecting the choice of stress variants emerge as age (older speakers give older variants), socio-professional status (филологи, journalists and writers are the most conservative), and region of habitation (Ukraine, Belorussia and the Baltics are innovative, northern Russian towns conservative); education appears to be less important as a factor in stress variation.

**Kolesov** (1967) gives the results of another written, self-reporting survey of 225 philology students at Leningrad State University, consisting partly of the questionnaire on morphology used in the survey discussed above, and partly of an original list of context-less word-forms. He finds for nouns that newer stress variants occur most commonly in 'freer' contexts; they are more likely to occur when not preceded by a preposition, or preceded simply by на, thus уви́деть гору́, на гору́ contrasting with traditional иди́ти в го́ру, че́рез го́ру. When the phrase has an adverbial meaning, eg за́ ночь, preposition stress is much more likely to occur than when this appears to be absent, eg об ста́ну. His survey also revealed the existence of non-literary variants not recorded in dictionaries, eg по боку́ (по́ боку, по бо́ку are given in



dictionaries), по сто́лу (по́ столу, по столу́ are given in dictionaries); the impact of these data is lessened, however, by the fact that not all the informants were native Russians.

In his discussion of the adjS, he believes that the stress of the adjL influences the stress of the adjS in contexts where the adjL would be more common in the colloquial language; thus the sentence *блѹдо о́чень о́стро* will most often have this stress for the adjS, since *о́строе* is more common in this context in the colloquial language. Where the adjL may not replace adjS, however, for example in the sentence *плáтьѣ тебѣ узко́*, the stress of the adjS will not be altered by analogy with the adjL. Where the adjS may also function as an adverb, this too may affect the stress, eg *высо́ко́*.

Kolesov concludes that the following factors may affect the stress of a word-form: the frequency of the word; the possibility of semantic differentiation by stress; the particular word-combination; derivational and syntactic factors in the colloquial language; stylistic connotations; the word's relationship to others in its semantic group; and the possibility of a word changing grammatical category, for example an adjS becoming an adverb. At the same time, he identifies a basic tendency for words with inflectional paradigms to generalise root-stress if monosyllabic (first syllable stress if dissyllabic, especially loan-words), and words with no inflectional paradigms to generalise desinence-stress, eg adverb *высо́ко́*.

**Rozental' & Telenkova** (1971) contains the result of a survey of over a thousand people, which took place over six or seven years and employed a range of methods. The subject under examination was the stress of the adjS and the pppS, in particular the currency of competing variants in the adjS f and pl and the pppS f; the adjS nt and other pppS forms were, regrettably, not examined. Their results show three clear tendencies regarding the development of particular variants; although the variants in question are recorded in some dictionaries, marked colloquial, the authors discovered that many of them in fact occur almost universally. These tendencies are towards adjS pl forms with desinence-stress

(replacing original stem-stress), adjS f forms with stem-stress (replacing original desinence-stress), and pppS f forms with stem-stress (replacing original desinence-stress).

**Gorbachevich** (1971, 1972, 1974, 1978), on the basis of his examination of studies on variation, as well as his own and others' surveys, concludes that the true reasons for variation are the workings of analogy and grammaticalisation; other factors, such as phonological considerations, the influence of dialects and of Church Slavonic, and socio-professional differences, he considers to be real, but he believes that their importance has been exaggerated (see Gorbachevich 1978:56-60). At the same time he points to a 'syntagmatic' factor in the placement of stress ("синтагматическая зависимость места ударения"), whereby a rhythmic consideration - that stress generally falls every two to three syllables in Russian - can be important in stress variation, for example, drawing stress towards the middle of a longer word; this is seen, he believes, in the past f of verbs with monosyllabic stems and dissyllabic prefixes, eg *оборвалá* > *оборвáла*, *разорвалá* > *разорвáла* (see pp.62-64, 109).

Some of his more interesting theses are examined below. He identifies two opposing trends in variation in the stress of the infinitive (1971:45-56; 1974; 1978:92-99): a movement of stress away from the root onto the 'suffix vowel' (eg -и- of 2nd conjugation verbs); and a movement from the suffix to the root, or to a suffix vowel nearer the root (eg -и́ровать replacing -и́ровáть). Variation in the stress of the infinitive is often accompanied by variation in the stress of other parts of the verbal paradigm, eg the pres/fut 2Sg+ and the imperative.

Concerning the stress of the past forms of prefixed verbs with monosyllabic roots (1978:104-8), he finds differing tendencies according to the structure of the verb. The following trends are noted, although they are certainly not proven beyond doubt:

- i) verbs with an originally dissyllabic root, and featuring two consonants at the morpheme boundary:

stress is attracted to the stem (from the prefix), eg назва́л, собра́л, подли́л, отпи́л;

ii) verbs with three consonants at the morpheme boundary: stress remains on the stem, eg отплы́л;

iii) verbs with an original monosyllabic root, and a prefix consisting of a single vowel or ending in a vowel: stress remains on the prefix, or variation occurs, eg о́жил, прóжил.

Thus, against an overall background of a movement towards stem-stress, syllable structure and the extent to which morphological boundaries are clear are also important; he notes, however, that older prefix-stress retains its popularity after a negative particle, eg не прóдал, не óтдал (1978:108).

For the adjS pl (pp.115-18), the most widespread variation is in the development of a newer desinence-stressed variant, eg бли́зкий for former бли́зки. Occasionally, however, the reverse pattern is found, eg бе́лы for original бе́лый. The development of desinence-stress is attributed to the following factors: the influence of adjectives whose adjS pl may only be desinence-stressed (бо́льные, сме́шные); the use of the desinence-stressed variant with an 'excessive' meaning (cf adjS nt), eg брю́ки малы́, cf also вы́сокий, ве́ликий, ши́рокий; a differentiation between predicative and attributive functions, eg слу́ти ему́ ве́рный, but ве́рны слу́ти (possible in eighteenth-century poetry), cf also по́лны че́го-то; and the desire to make a clear phonetic differentiation between Sg and Pl adjS forms.

adng Gorbachevich writes (1971:79ff.) that it is generally accepted that desinence-stress should occur where there is no suffixal element in the stem, eg чиста́, храбра́, or where the stem ends with a consonant (or /j/) and the suffix -н-, -л-, or -к-, eg бледна́, бойка́, близка́. He acknowledges, however, the widespread tendency in the modern language for stem-stress to replace desinence-stress for many such adjS f forms.

Concerning preposition + noun phrases, he points out the limited number of semantic groups to which the nouns involved in such phrases belong (see Gorbachevich 1972). These are as follows:

- a) body-parts, eg косá, головá;
- b) distances, spatial concepts, eg вёрх, сторонá;
- c) time periods, parts of day/night, eg гóд, ўтро;
- d) natural objects, household items, eg бéрег, двéрь.

The modern tendency, as demonstrated by survey evidence, is towards stressing the noun rather than the preposition, the cause of which Gorbachevich identifies as the influence of South Russian dialects, and analogy with other preposition and noun phrases where stress may not be retracted (eg по бéрегу, на берегú, so на берег becomes на бéрег). Prepositional stress may be preferred, however, where the phrase has an abstract, rather than concrete, meaning (eg пóд носом 'nearby', but цара́пина под нóсом 'a scratch under the nose'), and in particular contexts (eg удáрить пó лбу but провести рúку по лбú); where 'phraseologisation' (eg пустíть пó ветру) or 'adverbialisation' (eg зá лето, нá год) has taken place, prepositional stress will be resistant to restructuring.

#### The lexicographical sources used in this study

The present study draws on various standard reference works as its source of lexicographical and accentual data. The lexical items for examination in the survey were first established on the basis of information contained in these 'dictionary' sources, and the findings of the survey later analysed in comparison with the information contained about the words in these sources.

**Red.** and **Zal.** have already been discussed above, and need receive no further attention here. The most recent edition of the Academy Grammar (1980, henceforth **AG**) contains sections on stress and stress variation, which have been drawn on as appropriate. **Foug.** (Fougères 1974) is taken as

the source for adjL forms differentiated by stress from their related pppL forms.

Avanesov and Ozhegov's *Russkoe literaturnoe udarenie i proiznoshenie. Slovar' - spravochnik*, (1959, henceforth **A&O**) is the oldest lexicographical source drawn on in the present study, and contains approximately 52,000 items; normative stress is marked for word-forms, and acceptable alternative, sometimes older, variants are given, as well as variants which are not recommended or considered incorrect, and the like.

Information relating to a more current norm is taken from the *Orfoepicheskii slovar' russkogo iazyka* (1989, henceforth **OS**, first edition Bornunova et al., 1983), which is a fairly major reworking of A&O. Begun under the editorship of R. I. Avanesov, the most recent, fifth edition contains perhaps the most detailed information on variation in word-stress found in current dictionaries, with particularly full information on variation in the adjS, as highlighted in Lehfeldt's review of the dictionary (Lehfeldt, 1985b). Some 65,000 items are included, and the work also includes articles on pronunciation and stress (by R. I. Avanesov) and on grammatical forms (by N. A. Es'kova).

Ageenko & Zarva's *Slovar' udarenii russkogo iazyka* (1993, henceforth **SU**) is the most recent dictionary source drawn on in this survey. It contains around 76,000 entries, including proper nouns, and is based on the material contained in the earlier *Slovar' udarenii dlia rabotnikov radio i televideniia* (Bylinskii, 1960).

A phonetic description of stress in Russian and its phonological significance is contained in Jones & Ward (1969), Halle & Jones (1971), Lebedeva (1975) and Panov (1979). These works provide practical data on the acoustic correlates of stress and corresponding reduction patterns in vowels; the (broadly concurring) phonetic and phonological descriptions contained in them forms the basis of the identification of stressed syllables in the analysis of the recorded data which forms part of the present study.

### Chapter 3 Theoretical Approach

#### Introduction

As is clear from the survey of literature above (Chapter 2), many of the existing systems for the treatment of stress have been developed to make sense of nominal stress only, and are not so convincing when applied to other parts of speech; nouns have consistently received the most attention in the history of the study of stress, and even today studies (eg Nesset 1994) often limit their discussion to this part of the system. The present study aims at a more holistic approach, seeking to make as much sense of the verbal and adjectival systems as it does of the system in nouns.

Indeed, in this study, most time and space is given to areas of Russian stress less commonly investigated, and the discussion of areas which have received much attention by others is correspondingly limited. For example, a thorough investigation of preposition + noun/numeral phrases is included, of stress in reflexive verbs, of adjS forms, while rather less attention is paid to the larger mobile stress classes in nouns, variation in the pres/fut forms of verbs in -ИТЬ, and similar, well-covered ground.

This study's primary area of investigation is stress mobility in inflection, including areas traditionally associated with this, such as the retraction of stress onto negative particles, prefixes and prepositions. Stress in its relationship to word-derivational morphology is not examined in any detail, except where it traditionally forms a part of studies of inflection, eg the formation of the ppp; the stress of the adjL is also examined in relation to the adjS.

#### The morphological approach of this study

This study divides word-forms into the morphological units stem and (inflectional) desinence. Stems may consist of a root and affixes (prefix, suffixes, infixes), but not all of

these are found in all the word-forms belonging to the different word-classes examined; the occurrence of these units is summarised below.

The **noun** is divided into stem and (inflectional) desinence; thus *голова́* is considered to be composed of stem *голов-* and desinence *-а*. The present study does not deal with compound nouns, eg *ба́л-маскара́д*.

The **verb** is initially divided into stem and (inflectional) desinence; all verb forms are composed of at least these two elements, although the existence of zero-desinences is accepted. Everything preceding the inflectional desinence is considered part of the stem (cf Zal.). Stems consist of at least a root, and perhaps one or more affixes (prefix, infixes, suffixes); the reflexive particle may also be found. If the non-desinential part of a word-form is a root alone, it may still be referred to as a stem in this study. Some examples: *возьму́* is divided into stem *возьм-* and desinence *-у*; *говори́л* is divided into stem *говорил-* followed by a zero-desinence. *Проспа́лись* is divided into stem *проспал-*, desinence *-и* and the reflexive particle *-сь*; the stem can be further divided into prefix *про-*, root *-спа-*, and suffix *-л-*.

The **adjective** is made up of stem and (inflectional) desinence; thus *скромна́* is considered to be composed of stem *скромн-* and desinence *-а*.

This study also deals with two other phenomena which are interesting from the point of view of stress, and which form a useful adjunct to the areas already covered: **preposition + noun/numeral phrases**, which consist of a stressed preposition followed by an unstressed noun or numeral, together forming one phonological word (a unit containing one main stress); and **negative particle + past/pppS phrases**, consisting of a stressed negative particle followed by an unstressed verbal past tense or the pppS, again together forming one phonological word.

Stress is sometimes used in inflectional morphology to distinguish word-forms, often reinforcing morphological distinctions also indicated by the desinence, such as case,

gender, number, or a combination of these three. This study takes as its basic unit the parts of the word-form which occur before the desinence; the desinence (and reflexive suffix, if there is one) is disregarded. This basic unit, with its concomitant stress or absence of stress, is called a **stress-form** or **SF**.

Words with mobile stress have different SFs in the word-forms contrasted by stress; as a result of different syllables being stressed, the phonetic shape of that part of the word-form occurring before the desinence varies. (This may be accompanied by other distinctions, such as consonant mutation, which is generally disregarded for the purposes of this study). Thus the forms *голова́* NSg and *го́ловы* N/APl have the contrasting SFs [gə'lʌ'v]- and ['gə'ləv]-; the forms *за́нял* past m and *за́няла́* past f have the contrasting SFs [zəŋ'ɫ] and [zəŋ'ɫ]. It will be noted that, although SFs are phonological units, SFs are given in their various phonetic realisations, rather than in phonemic transcription; the reason for preferring a phonetic presentation to a phonemic one is that, although there is a wide measure of agreement about the phonetic transcription of Russian, its phonemic transcription remains highly controversial. In the transcriptions, the sign ' indicates the beginning of a syllable bearing stress, and the mark - that the SF is followed by a desinence.

Thus the theoretical basis of this study is that stress is used distinctively, to distinguish forms by creating different, contrasting SFs. This could be called a hearer-centred approach, since the distinct SFs, heard chronologically before the desinence, are a clear cue to the hearer as to the identity of the form, aiding the hearer in the task of identifying the word-form in question, and distinguishing it from others occurring in the paradigm. Most often, stress functions as an additional cue to the identity of the form, alongside a distinctive desinence; on some occasions, however, word-forms may be distinguished phonologically only by a difference in stress; here, the SF is the only cue to the identity of the word, eg *го́ловы* GSG versus *го́ловы* N/APl.



SFs point out contrasts made by stress, that is, at the phonological level. Morphemic distinctions (such as stem-stress versus desinence-stress) are clearly also of some importance in Russian stress, since morphemic contrasts are found for many words from different word-classes. This receives more detailed discussion in later sections of this chapter. As a result of the apparent importance of morphemic contrasts for some parts of the system of stress, the categorisation presented in this study incorporates traditional categories based on morphemic stress patterns within a framework of patterns of SF contrast.

SF contrasts are found in all situations where mobile stress occurs in forms which can be placed in an inflectional paradigm. This applies even where there are two orthographic words but one phonological word; thus, for example, the negative particle + verb phrase *не́ был* contrasts with *не бы́ла* by having two SFs: [*ʎεˈbɜ1*] (stressed on the negative particle) and [*ʎεˈbɜ1*]- (with following desinence-stress). No SF contrasts can be said to occur, however, where a word-form is not part of an inflectional paradigm, as is the case with preposition + noun/numeral phrases. Here, stress retraction would seem to function as part of a different system of stress mobility, and not one in which contrasts are drawn within a paradigm (see section (b) below).

Syntactic differences may also be correlated with a contrast of SFs. Thus for *вита́я*, SU gives *ви́тая* for the pppS f, and *вита́я* for the adjS f. This contrast of SFs according to syntactic function can be demonstrated with two sentences: *верёвка, ви́тая ма́мой, лежа́ла там*, with SF [*ʎit*]- for the pppS f; but *вита́я ле́стница ве́ла на́вэрх*, with SF [*ʎʉt*]- for the adjS f. Likewise for *молча́*, SU gives *молча́* for the gerund and *мо́лча* for the adverb. The contrast is seen in the sentences *почему́-то молча́, она́ смотре́ла в окно́*, with SF [*molʃ*]- but *о́н уше́л мо́лча из ко́мнаты*, with SF [*molʃ*]-.

SF contrasts may play a similar role in the derivation of the pppS. Here, for example, the SF [*prəʃʉta1*] in *про́читал* contrasts with the SF [*prəʃʉtən*] in *про́читан*, with its retracted stress. Thus the past and the pppS are placed

side by side, as an example of what might be called, following Vovk (1979:46-53), 'categorical stress mobility'.

An initial survey of stress patterns found in different parts of the lexicon immediately reveals a similarity of patterns across the language. The past, pppS and adjS, for example, each have four word-forms - m, f, nt, and pl - and the patterns of stress found appear, from sources, to be the same: fixed stem-stress, fixed desinence-stress, and m, nt, and pl stem-stressed contrasting f desinence-stressed (but see sections below for discussion of the last pattern). This similarity will ideally be reflected in any categorisation of stress patterns; in the present study, the same system of numbering of stress classes is used for the different word-classes.

The morphemic patterns of stress traditionally identified are fixed stem-stress, fixed desinence-stress, and mobile stress. In the categorisation presented in this study the whole number 1 always refers to the absence of SF contrasts, that is fixed stress, with 1.1 indicating fixed stem-stress and 1.2 fixed desinence-stress. Whole numbers 2 and above are used for categories displaying SF contrasts, that is, mobile stress of some pattern or another. Patterns 1.1, 1.2 and 2, as indicated above, are found for many different areas within the scope of this study, eg nouns, the pres/fut of verbs, the past of verbs, adjectives, and the pppS.

Where SF contrasts appear and there is a zero-desinence, these are noted by the use of letters following the number code; words with stress fixed on one morpheme, but with an SF contrast and a zero-desinence in one form or another, are naturally included in fixed stress classes (1.1 etc.), rather than mobile classes (2 and upwards).

In the discussion of nouns, fixed stem-stress is class 1.1, and fixed desinence-stress class 1.2. Classes 2 upwards represent different patterns of mobility.

In the discussion of verbs, fixed stress of different sorts in the pres/fut and past (taken as separate sub-paradigms) is represented by classes 1.1 to 1.3. Categories 2 and 3 upwards represent different patterns of mobility in the

pres/fut or past. Mobility in the pppS is only found in category 2.

In the discussion of the pppS and the adjS, fixed stem-stress is class 1.1, and fixed desinence-stress is class 1.2. Pattern 2 represents mobility of some sort.

The adjL has only fixed stress, either on the stem (class 1.1) or the desinence (class 1.2). The pppL has fixed stem-stress.

The five areas of stress mobility and variation taken as the object of the present study are examined in the chapters which follow. The system of stress in each area is discussed, a categorisation for the different stress patterns introduced, and elements of variation in the system identified.

## a) Nouns

### Introduction

Two basic types of system exist for the classification of word-stress in nouns, and in Russian in general. The more popular of these can be called the **morphemic** approach, which views word-forms in terms of which morpheme (eg stem or desinence) bears the stress. Such an approach follows the view of Baudouin de Courtenay (quoted in Khazagerov 1985:142) that:

В русском языке, как в языке с морфологически подвижным и вообще морфологизированным ударением, следует говорить не об ударении слогов, а об ударении морфем.

Zalizniak's classification of patterns of noun stress (as it appears in Zal.) will be taken as an example of a morphemic system; the reason for the choice of his system rather than one of the many others which follow a similar method (eg Red., Schütz 1987) is that Zalizniak's system is consistent, methodologically simple (in terms of the number of categories of nouns required), and accompanied by a very large number of examples in the form of the contents of the dictionary itself.

A different approach is favoured by some other writers; Superanskaia, for example, writes that the morphemic approach is "...не для всякого исследования справедливо" (1968:21, quoted in Khazagerov 1985:142). Instead, she favours what could be called a **syllabic** approach, which views stress in terms of which syllable it falls on, counting from the beginning or end of the word. This approach is particularly relevant where the data are not readily divisible morphemically; Superanskaia (1966, 1968), for example, is investigating proper nouns and loan-words. However, the approach is applied to nouns in general by writers such as Golenishchev-Kutuzov (1959, a study of versification), Nikonov (1963, on restrictions on stress placement in the word-form), and Nessel (1994). Gorbachevich (see 1978:61) also deems an exclusively morphemic approach insufficient, since it

excludes considerations such as the rhythmic organisation of the spoken language around syllable-groups of certain lengths.

A morphemic system is one which accounts for the movement of stress from one morpheme in the noun to another. Thus the stress may move from the stem of the noun onto the desinence, eg *дѣло* N/ASg, *делá* N/APl, or from desinence to stem, eg *головá* NSg, *голову* ASg. Stress movement in an example such as *óзеро* N/ASg, *озѣра* N/APl is not readily captured or accounted for by this system, since the movement is from stem-initial syllable to stem-final syllable, that is, within the stem morpheme, and not from one morpheme to another.

Syllabic systems, by contrast, state exactly on which syllable the stress falls in terms of its position in relation to the beginning, or the end, of the word-form (sometimes called the left or right word-boundary). The word-form *óзеро* N/ASg, for example, is considered as being stressed on the first syllable, counting from the beginning of the word, whereas *озѣра* N/APl is stressed on the second syllable from the beginning.

Thus a morphemic analysis will place the noun *дѣло* in a class along with all other nouns that display stress movement from the stem in all Sg cases to the desinence in all Pl cases; other members of this class would be nt nouns such as *вóйско*, *мóре*, *óблако*, *íмя*, masculine nouns with NPl in *-á*, such as *áдрес*, *бѣрег*, *профѣссор*, and in *-ы/-í*, such as *пíр* and *дóлг*. The noun *óзеро* N/ASg, *озѣра* N/APl, on the other hand, would be classed alongside the many thousands of words that display no morphemic stress movement, and would either be marked as an exception to the general pattern of fixed stress for this class, or simply ignored.

A syllabic system, by contrast, would note the movement of stress that occurs in *óзеро-озѣра* without difficulty, and might place the noun in a class with those displaying stress movement one syllable forward (or to the right) in the Pl, or from the first to second syllable.

Since the beginning of this century, most writers have chosen the morphemic approach, with a few, such as Zalizniak,

attempting to apply further rules for predicting where the stress will fall within the morpheme, that is, which particular syllable of a stressed stem or desinence will be stressed. This approach, which attempts to make up for the deficiencies of the morphemic approach, could be called an **improved morphemic** approach.

Zalizniak formulates rules for finding the position of stress within the morpheme, stating, for example, that if, ~~according to paradigm (ie stress pattern), a particular word-form should be stressed on the stem, then,~~ if the *исходная форма* (the initial form) is stem-stressed, the stress will *un-stressed* fall on the same syllable as in the initial form in all its other word-forms; in other words, no movement of stress compared with the NSg would be expected within the stem of any stem-stressed word-form. The word *маш́ина*, for example, is stem-stressed in the initial form (NSg), and thus in its Pl forms, where according to its paradigm in Zalizniak's system stem-stress occurs, the stress should fall on the same syllable, ie *маш́ины* (N/APl).

Zalizniak's rule continues that, if the initial form is desinence-stressed, however, then when the paradigm indicates stem-stress, the stress will fall on the final syllable of the stem (or the penultimate syllable, if there is a fleeting vowel), except for words belonging to certain classes (Zalizniak's classes f and f'). Thus the feminine noun *колбасá* has, according to its paradigm, stem-stress in the NPl; the stress will, according to Zalizniak's prediction, fall on the final syllable of the stem in this form, giving *колбáсы*, N/APl. Classes f and f', by contrast, place the stress on the first syllable of the stem when stem-stressed, as with the feminine noun *железá* NSg 'gland', *жéлезы* N/APl.

For the example *óзеро*, which is stem-stressed in the initial form, we would expect from Zalizniak's rules that the N/APl, stem-stressed according to the paradigm, would be *\*óзера*, with stress falling on the same syllable as in the N/ASg. This is not so, however, and Zalizniak is forced, despite the improvements in his morphemic system, to list *óзеро* as an exception, one of thirty or so words which in

particular word-forms are stressed on a different syllable of the stem from that which is predicted by his rules.

All morphemic approaches, whether 'improved' like Zalizniak's or not, implicitly analyse stress movement from the point of view of the speaker; they could be called **speaker-centred** approaches. They look, as it were, into the mind of the speaker, and argue that the speaker has a set of 'desinence morphemes', and a set of 'stem morphemes', and that, rather than worrying about movements from one syllable to another for certain word-forms belonging to certain lexemes, the mind contains this information in the form of patterns of stress movement, which it generalises unless it receives information to the contrary. Some writers go even further, and say that the desinence and stem morphemes each have particular inherent stress values, which interact when they are combined; this is at the heart of Garde's 'morpheme valency' approach (see Garde 1980), and is of central importance to the study of derivational morphology (see Zalizniak 1985; Lagerberg 1992).

It is interesting, however, to approach the question of mobile stress from the point of view of the hearer, taking what might be called a **hearer-centred** approach. The hearer-centred approach outlined in this study introduces a time-dimension into the understanding of the function of mobile stress. As the mind hears a string of phonetic information, ordered in a linear sequence, it tries to decode this into meaningful units; if it is a noun, the mind tries to identify the lexeme and decipher the grammatical information contained in its stem, as well as its desinence. To take as an example the sequence **голов-**: as soon as the listener hears the phonetic sequence [**g o l o v**]- he knows that the word in question can only be the ASg or N/APl. The desinence of the word-form confirms the case and number (ASg or N/APl), but the field of choice has already been defined by the phonetic shape of the first two syllables heard.

This process is of particular importance where the desinence that occurs is not restricted to one particular word-form. For example, the word-forms **дела** GSg and **дела́** N/APl (belonging to the lexeme **де́ло**), are homomorphs,

differing only in their stress, and thus in the realisation of the vowels of each word-form. Possible confusion for the hearer is avoided by stress and the resulting reduction of vowels, the first syllable being realised either as ['dʲɛ1]- (if GSg), or [dʲʷ1]- (if N/AP1).

This approach gives primary importance to the phonetically distinct stem forms which result from the stress falling on different syllables in the word-form; it can thus be called a **distinctive approach**. The basic unit involved in the formation of contrasts is the part of the word-form occurring before the desinence, the desinence being, in this approach, disregarded; this basic unit, with its stress, is referred to as a **stress-form** (henceforward **SF**).

Whereas the morphemic approach is concerned with which morpheme in the word-form is stressed, and the syllabic approach with which syllable is stressed, counting from the left or right, the distinctive approach examines which word-forms are contrasted with other word-forms in the paradigm by means of stress.

It should be noted that one aspect of the 'distinctive' role of stress was remarked on by the earliest writers on Russian. Ludolf's *Grammatika Russica* (1696), the earliest known grammar of Russian, remarks on the role of stress in distinguishing homomorphs, giving the example of *мы́ка* 'torture' and *мыка́* 'flour'; this example is also quoted in many later grammars.

At the same time, the majority of works which attempt to give some account of Russian stress are shaped by the acceptance of an established order of grammatical cases, and by an emphasis on the NSg as the initial form from which all other forms are derived, and, by extension, to which their stress must be related. This approach views the differently stressed word-forms of one lexeme as movements away from, or a return to, the stress of the initial form. Thus, the grammar of Vostokov (1844) talks about words which show stress movement from the GSg onwards, or from the NPl onwards, and so on.

Studies of speech disorders (such as aphasia), frequency studies on the occurrence of the various cases, and analyses



of inflectional patterns would seem to indicate that the NSg does indeed have some primacy. Examinations of the diachronic process of analogical change (affecting both stress and morphological desinences), on the other hand, whilst indicating that certain case-forms are favoured over others as the basis for analogical change, display no unanimity as to which cases these are (cf Kip., Nessel 1994).

There is little evidence that the mind orders the case-forms in the way found in traditional grammatical studies. Our proposed model of how the different stresses of the word-forms of one lexeme are dealt with is given below. For clarity's sake, word-forms are generally listed in the order familiar to many English-speaking students of Russian, although it should be noted that a native speaker who had not been influenced by the theories of grammarians, and their subsequent appearance in text-books, would not, we believe, place the word-forms in any particular order or hierarchy.

The noun **звезда́** consists of two syllables (apart from the IPL) in all but one of its word-forms. From a morphemic point of view, these are the stem **звезд-**, which may be realised as [zʏʈʌd]-/[zʏʈʌʒ]- if unstressed, or ['zʏʈʌd]-/['zʏʈʌst] if stressed, and the inflectional desinences -а, -у, -ы, -е, -ой, -ам, -ами, -ах and zero. The word-forms can be divided into those which begin with the unstressed variants of the pre-desinential portion, the realisation of SF1, and those which begin with the stressed variants, the realisation of SF2:

SF1	SF2
[zʏʈʌd]-/[zʏʈʌʒ]-	['zʏʈʌd]-/['zʏʈʌst]
звезда́	звёзды
звездѹ́	звёзд
звездѹ́	звёздам
звездѹ́	звёздами
звездѹ́	звёздах

Replacing the word-forms with their grammatical categories gives the following pattern:

SF1	SF2
NSg	N/AP1
ASg	GP1
GSg	DPl
D/PSg	IP1
ISg	PPl

The two columns contain word-forms sharing the same SF, that is the same pre-desinential portion as regards the position of the stress. A further example, *село́*, confirms that for these two nouns at least, the grammatical morpheme {plurality} is encoded not only in the desinences of the Pl word-forms, but also in the SF:

SF1	SF2
$[\text{ɤ}'1]-/[\text{ɤ}'1\text{ɔ}]-$	$[\text{'ɤ}01]-$
село́	сёла
села́	сёл
селу́	сёлам
селом	сёлами
селе́	сёлах

This 'distinctive' approach, then, separates the word-forms of a lexeme into groups, according to their SFs; word-forms appearing in the same group have the same SF, and thus display significant phonetic similarities in their pre-desinential portions. By looking at mobile stress from the point of view of SF contrasts, and investigating on this basis what patterns of contrasting stress-forms in different grammatical cases are found, which cases are most often distinguished by a different SF, whether the contrasts are two-way or three-way, and so on, new light can be shed on the function of mobile stress in Russian.

Stress is viewed in this 'distinctive' approach as either the only feature distinguishing two forms, or, more commonly, an additional cuing factor, aiding perception. The existence of multiple cues to the grammatical identity of a

form is unremarkable in itself; such redundancy is found in many aspects of language. From a pragmatic point of view, conditions for communication are often imperfect, and thus multiple cues are to be expected; it is interesting to note that stress is generally not marked in the written word.

### System of stress

The following section examines all the stress patterns found in modern Russian nouns. Proper nouns and compound nouns have been excluded; suppletive forms are considered separate from the rest of the paradigm, as discussed below.

The great majority of Russian nouns have fixed stress; these are all classed in this analysis as belonging to category 1. Those with fixed stem-stress are by far the largest group; the nouns хра́м (masculine), ли́па (feminine), and бо́лото (neuter) may be taken as representative of this group, called class 1.1; each has only one SF (with two phonetic realisations): ['xram]-/['xramʲ]-, ['lʲip]-/['lʲipʲ]- and [bɔ'lot]-/[bɔ'lotʲ]- respectively. Stress is fixed throughout their inflectional paradigm, and plays no part in distinguishing the different word-forms which occur.

A smaller group of nouns, class 1.2, displays fixed desinence-stress. These words may be represented by the noun пращá. The stress falls on the desinence of all word-forms, and, as before, there is only one SF: [prɐ'ʃ:]-.

Some neuter nouns such as о́чкó also appear in this class.

Some words traditionally classed alongside these, however, in fact appear to have two SFs. The noun ко́бурá has the following pattern:

[kəbɔ'ɾ]-/[kəbɔ'ɾ]

[kɐ'bur]

кобура́  
 кобуру́  
 кобуры́  
 кобурэ́  
 кобуро́й  
 кобура́м  
 кобура́ми  
 кобура́х

кобу́р

Here, recourse is made to the concept of *условное ударение*, or theoretical stress (also known as conditioned or necessitated stress) as formulated by Zalizniak (1964). This concept is important in the classification of the stress-patterns not only of nouns, but of other word-classes also. It is a way of dealing with the zero-desinence forms that occur, for example, in the N/ASg of masculine nouns, and the GPL of many neuter and feminine nouns, such as кобура́ above. (Zalizniak in fact assigns theoretical stress to all word-forms, stating that this coincides with the actual stress for all except zero-desinence forms; for the purposes of the present study, however, the concept of theoretical stress need only be referred to where there is a zero-desinence). The masculine noun *сто́л*, for example, has a zero-desinence in the N/ASg; it is thus impossible to know synchronically whether the stress is on the stem, and the desinence unstressed, or whether the stress is on the desinence, which since it is zero and thus non-syllabic, cannot be stressed, and therefore 'passes the stress back' onto the stem (cf Mustajoki 1981).

Since there is, in Zalizniak's opinion, never a difference between the stress of the NSg and the DSg, or between the GPL and the DPL (although a few exceptions to this are pointed out by Worth, 1968, and other writers, see below), Zalizniak proposes taking the stress of the DSg as indicating the theoretical stress of a zero-desinence NSg, and the stress of the DPL as indicating the theoretical stress of a zero-desinence GPL (a similar approach is found in Red. and many other writers). It should be noted that the dative case is not considered hierarchically superior to other word-forms in the paradigm, or of pre-eminent importance in processes of analogical change; it is merely

useful from a classificatory point of view as representative of the oblique cases in the Sg or Pl sub-paradigm.

Assigning the N/ASg or GPl the stress of the dative of the relevant number is desirable not least from the point of view of economy. *СТОЛ* can now be classed as having fixed desinence-stress in all forms, rather than stem-stress in the N/ASg, and desinence-stress in all other forms. It can thus be put in the same class as the feminine noun *пращя́*. Likewise, the GPl of *сло́во* can be taken as having theoretical desinence-stress, stress falling of necessity on the stem, owing to the zero-desinence. Thus *сло́во* may be considered desinence-stressed throughout the Pl, as opposed to desinence-stressed in all forms of the Pl apart from the stem-stressed GPl. This greatly reduces the number of stress classes which must be posited.

The special treatment of the GPl is also justified from other points of view. The GPl often seems to have an intermediary role in the Pl sub-paradigm, floating in allegiance between the N/APl on the one hand (NPl for animate nouns), and the D, I, and PPl on the other. The assigning of theoretical stress to forms with a zero-desinence may also be justified from a historical point of view, on those occasions where, in the opinion of some writers, stem-final stress<sup>in the N/ASg</sup> has arisen from the loss of a stressed desinential jer; however, it should be emphasised that there is no implication that all word-forms assigned theoretical desinence-stress historically contained a stressed jer.

Whilst a minority of writers reject or ignore the concept of theoretical stress (see Chapter 2), and some accept it partially (eg only in the case of zero-desinence GPl forms, or just for the N/ASg of masculine nouns), the majority of writers accept theoretical stress either openly or implicitly. It is particularly favoured by those examining the systematic functioning of Russian word-stress and concerned with the 'grammatical' function of stress, for example its distinguishing of direct from oblique cases in nouns (see below). From this point of view, as well<sup>as</sup> in its reduction of the number of different stress classes identified, it both clarifies and simplifies the presentation

of Russian stress, and forms an important part of the classification system presented in this study.

To return to our discussion of data, it will now be seen that *кобура́* has in reality fixed desinence-stress in all forms except the stem-stressed GPL, which has a zero-desinence. It shows a two-way SF contrast, with SF2 occurring in the GPL only. Since the theoretical stress of the GPL is desinential, however, *кобура́* and words like it are in this study placed in the relevant stress class (ignoring the GPL), and the code 'G' added after the class number; the letter 'G' indicates that the GPL is involved in an SF contrast, being stressed on the last syllable of the word (the stem-final syllable) owing to its zero-desinence. Thus *кобура́* is given the code 1.2G, since it follows the pattern of *праща́* in all forms except the GPL. Examples are also found amongst neuter nouns, eg *торжество́* 1.2G.

*сто́л* and other masculine nouns are treated in the same way. As soon as the SF [*'sto1*] is heard, the hearer decodes this information as indicating the N/ASg; if the SF [*st^11*]-/[*st^11*]- is heard, on the other hand, the word-form is already marked as being in a different Sg case or belonging to the Pl number. This is demonstrated diagrammatically below:

[*'sto1*]

сто́л

[*st^11*]-/[*st^11*]-

стола́  
столу́  
столо́м  
столе́  
столы́  
столо́в  
стола́м  
стола́ми  
стола́х

Nouns like *сто́л* follow the same pattern as other fixed desinence-stressed nouns, except that in the N/ASg they have a zero-desinence with theoretical desinence-stress. Following the method used in the above, nouns like *сто́л* are marked 1.2N, where the letter 'N' indicates that the N/ASg is involved in an SF contrast, being stressed on the last syllable of the word (that is, stem-finally) owing to its

zero-desinence. The 1.2N nouns *ýгорь* and *ýгол* are stressed, exceptionally, stem-initially in the N/ASg.

Nouns such as *гóрод*, *бéрег*, *профéссор* (masculine) and *пóле* (neuter) show an SF contrast between the Sg and Pl. Class 2.1, which contains these nouns, is composed of around two hundred and fifty masculine nouns, and a few neuter nouns. In the same class belong words such as *дéло*, marked 2.1G. There are around twenty monosyllabic-stemmed neuter nouns like *дéло* following this pattern.

The nouns *мáсло* and *крýжево* are also 2.1G, but with certain peculiarities: *мáсло* gains an unstressed fleeting vowel in the GPl *мáсел*, and the GPl *крýжев* is stressed stem-initially, as in the Sg, rather than stem-finally.

A few dissyllabic-stemmed nouns such as *зéркало* show the same SF contrast of Sg and Pl (N/ASg *зéркало*, N/APl *зеркалá*). Since these words have dissyllabic stems, however, the zero-desinence of the GPl *зеркáл* has a distinct, third SF. The SFs found are thus as follows:

SF1	SF2	SF3
['zɛrkəl]-/['zɛrkəl]-	[zɪrkʌ'l]-	[zɪr'kəl]
зéркало	зеркалá	зеркáл
зéркала	зеркалáм	
зéркалу	зеркалáми	
зéркалом	зеркалáх	
зéркале		

In line with the approach presented above for the treatment of zero-desinences, the GPl is considered to have theoretical desinence-stress, and assigned to the same class as *пóле* (2.1) but with the addition of the code 'g', thus 2.1g. The use of lower case 'g' signifies a three-way distinction, with SF3 found in the GPl; SF3 is a distinct SF, not coinciding with SF1 (Sg) or SF2 (Pl except the GPl). Nouns marked with the letter 'g' either have polysyllabic (most often dissyllabic) stems, or have a fleeting vowel which appears in the GPl only.

A small group of words like *óзеро* and *знáмя* show the SF contrasts found in pattern 2.1, but with Pl word-forms stressed stem-finally, rather than desinentially. On closer

examination, however, it emerges that all the other words showing this pattern of stress have suppletive Pl forms, viz *дерево, ко́лос, о́бод, по́лоз, ка́мень* (with Pl *каме́нья*), and the Sg and Pl stress patterns may be considered separately (see below).

Nouns such as *звездá* and *селó* contrast SFs in the Sg and Pl, like *ро́род* and *по́ле* (class 2.1); whereas class 2.1 nouns contrast stem-stress in the Sg with desinence-stress in Pl, however, these nouns do the reverse, and are given the class-number 2.2. They are thus treated as a subdivision of the category of words which contrast SFs in the Sg and Pl, category 2. Class 2.2 contains around one hundred feminine nouns like *звездá* and fifty neuter nouns like *селó*.

It should be noted, in passing, that the zero-desinence of the GP1 of *звездá* and *селó* presents no difficulties; membership of the Pl paradigm is indicated clearly by the [o] vowel of the stem, and no recourse needs to be made to the concept of theoretical stress.

Words such as *сестра́* stand in a similar relationship to *звездá* as *зе́ркало* does to *де́ло*. The GP1 *сестёр* (this is in fact A/GP1, but this is ignored for the purposes of this analysis) has a zero-desinence, and is stressed on the last syllable of the stem, with a fleeting vowel carrying this stress, thus creating a third SF; this is despite the fact that the other Pl case-forms have stem-initial stress, which would be expected for the GP1 also. Words following this pattern are given the code 2.2g. The following words have been identified (variously by Worth 1968; Shapiro 1986; Nessel 1994) as following this pattern, or having variants that create this pattern: *кольцо́, крыльцо́, яйцо́, овца́, гумно́, окно́, сестра́*. The nouns *судья́, семья́* and *свинья́* also belong to this group, or have variants which create this pattern; the GP1 is again stressed unexpectedly stem-finally, stress falling on a fleeting *e*, inserted before the stem-final [j].

A third major pattern is represented by the masculine noun *зуб*. SF1 ['zʊp]/['zʊb]-/['zʊb]- found in the Sg and the N/AP1, contrasts SF2 [zʌ'b]- in the other Pl cases. Again, the phonetic realisations of SF1 and SF2 differ in their vowel quality. This group - category 3 - contains approximately fifty masculine nouns, 120 or so feminine nouns, most of



which have a zero-desinence in the NSg, eg *вѣшь, крѣпость, нѣчь*, and the neuter nouns *ухо* and *око*, if they are taken as forming one declension with their Pl forms *уши, очи*, which are originally the N/A dual of the i-stem declension.

Category 4 contains words following the pattern of *рубá* and *ноздря́*. The nouns *ноздря́, свеча́* and *сопля́* contrast the SF of the N/APl (eg [*'nozɔɖɕ*]- ) with the SF of all other cases (eg [*ɐɫ'zɔɖɕ*]- ). Most other nouns in this category, however, are like *рубá*, and have theoretical desinence-stress (by comparison with the DPl) in the zero-desinence GPl; the SF of the GPl is the same as that of the N/APl - [*'gʊɐ*]/[*'gʊɐb*]- - and these words are consequently classed as 4G. Category 4 also contains a few neuter nouns such as *тавро́, ярмо́, плечо́* and *крыльцо́*. Many nouns which have been placed in this class have variant forms, and are discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

*Гвоздь, ко́нь, гру́здь* and *че́рвь* display the same pattern of SF oppositions, in all cases except the NSg (for animates) or N/ASg (for inanimates). Like *сто́л* (1.2N), they are stem-stressed in the N/ASg owing to their zero-desinence, and are considered to have theoretical desinence-stress. For this reason they are given the code 4N.

Categories 1, 2, 3 and 4 encompass the commonest patterns of stress in nouns. Five further categories, the first four of which contain only feminine nouns, each contain fewer than twenty words. These categories are less significant in that their membership is small, and that they are non-productive in modern Russian; a great number of the words assigned to these groups also show stress variants which would place them in different categories. It is perhaps appropriate to regard them as relics of an older system of stress, now abandoned in the language. By the same token, they are of particular interest for the present study, since the high level of variation in their stress can be examined in an attempt to find trends in the development of stress mobility. The patterns are also significant from a synchronic point of view, of course, since many of the words they contain are of a high frequency (cf Tornow 1984:296-97).

Category 5 is represented by *рыба́*, which follows the pattern of *рубá* (4G) except for the ASg, where the SF is the

same as in the N/APl. It is classed as 5G, since, as with *губá*, the zero-desinence of the GPl results in stem-stress in this form. All nouns in category 5 in fact appear in class 5G, since they uniformly have a zero-desinence in the GPl.

*Водá*, representing category 6, follows the pattern of *звездá* except for the ASg, which has the same SF as the Pl word-forms. In each of categories 5G and 6 there are between fifteen and twenty feminine nouns.

Nouns such as *сковородá* (4g), *головá* (5g) and *земля́* (6g), like *зёркало* (2.1g) and *сестра́* (2.2g), display a three-way SF distinction, with SF3 used in a sole word-form, the zero-desinence GPl. *Головá*, for example, has SFs [gə1ʌv]-/[gə1ʌʏ]-, [ˈgɔ1əv]- and [gʌˈlof]; the last of these is an instant indication to the hearer of the GPl. The stem is further modified with some nouns, by the insertion of a fleeting vowel; *скамья́* (4g) has GPl *скамей*, with a stressed fleeting-vowel inserted before the stem-final [j], and a zero-desinence; *земля́* (6g) has GPl *земель*, with a stressed fleeting-vowel and a zero-desinence.

The three final patterns which can be identified, patterns 7, 8 and 9, each contain around five or fewer nouns. Class 7N consists of the words *вошь*, *ложь*, *рожь*, and *любовь* (and the derived *нелюбовь*, which will not be further considered). These words contrast the SF of the (stem-stressed) ISg, which is shared with the zero-desinence N/ASg, with the SF found in all other (desinence-stressed) cases, Sg and Pl, where these word-forms exist. In all cases except the N/ASg and ISg, the only stem vowel or, where there are two stem vowels, the second stem vowel, is lost. The code N is added since it is considered that the N/ASg has theoretical desinence-stress (by comparison with the stress of the DSg).

Category 8N (first classed separately by Zalizniak, see 1967:156) contains the words *грудь*, *ось*, *степь* and *глушь*. They have the same pattern as class 7N nouns in the Sg, but the N/APl has the same SF as the N/ASg and ISg; *глушь* is only found in the Sg, but does not feature the stem vowel loss characteristic of class 7N nouns.

The anomalous ISg form of words belonging to categories 7 and 8 receives a different analysis in the work of Worth

(1968) and Stankiewicz (1979, first published 1972). These writers posit a stressed zero in the ISg desinence (ie -'Øju) which automatically passes the stress to the left, onto the stem-final syllable. This allows words belonging to class 7N to be placed in class 1.2 (fixed desinence-stress), and words in class 8N to be placed in class 4. However, under this approach one is forced to assign theoretical desinence-stress to forms which have unstressed desinences; the present study thus follows Zal. in assigning separate classes to these words, which are, in any case, the object of special study. Worth's analysis of the nouns *заём*, *наём*, and compounds *перенаём*, *перезаём* (see Chapter 2) is also rejected; they are considered, with *перёд*, to follow pattern 1.1, with an exceptional N/ASg form, stressed stem-finally.

Category 9, the final category, contains only the words *дети* and *люди*. These may be considered to be the suppletive Pl forms of *ребёнок* and *человек*. It is thus of dubious value to combine the Sg and Pl stress patterns of these words and consider the resulting pattern, as many writers do, including Zalizniak (1963, but not 1975). In the present study, the Sg forms are treated separately, and placed in class 1.1. The unusual stress pattern of the Pl forms gives category 9; the SF in the N, D and P, which have stem-stress, contrasts with the SF of the G and I, which have desinence-stress.

Likewise, on other occasions where suppletive Sg or Pl forms are found, the two sub-paradigms should be treated separately in terms of their stress patterns. Suppletive Pl forms, stressed stem-finally (N/APl in -ья), exist for a few nouns such as *лист*, *крюк*, *прут* and *сук*; nouns such as *ко́лос* and *де́рево*, with suppletive Pl forms, have been discussed above; suppletive Pl forms (NPl in -ята) are also found for *щено́к*, *бесёнок* and *чертёнок*; and the noun *граждани́н* has suppletive Sg forms, containing the singulative suffix -ин; *мечта́* has the suppletive GPL form *мечта́ний*. It is clearly inappropriate to design new stress categories to account for the patterns which are found if the suppletive forms are considered together with the regular forms.

This completes the survey of most of the nouns of modern Russian. It will be noted that categories 1, 2, 3 and 4

contain the great majority of Russian nouns, whilst categories 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 contain in total under fifty items.

The logic of the numbering system used in the categorisation introduced above, and given in table form below, can be explained as follows: a number is given to each different pattern of contrasting SFs, that is, each different **category**. Category 1 thus contains words where there are no SF contrasts; category 2 contains words where the SF found in all Pl word-forms contrasts with the SF found in all Sg forms; and so on for the other categories. In this way, as presented above, categories 1 to 9 are found.

The categories are further divided into different **classes**, primarily on a morphemic basis. Categories 1 and 2 are subdivided by decimals (.1, .2) into four classes. Nouns belonging to the class bearing the decimal .1 have stem-stress in the Sg (or throughout), whilst those belonging to the class bearing the decimal .2 have desinence-stress in the Sg (or throughout). It is thus possible to refer to classes 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The letters 'G', 'g' and 'N', which may appear after the class number, indicate that the word in question varies from the pattern of that class in certain word-forms. These word-forms have an unexpected SF contrast arising in a form with a zero-desinence. The code 'N' indicates that the N/ASg (in inanimate masculine nouns) has a zero-desinence and a contrasting SF (eg *стóл*). 'G' and 'g' indicate that the GPl has a zero-desinence and a contrasting SF; 'G' is used where the SF found in the GPl contrasts with that of the DPl, and the noun thus displays a two-way SF contrast (eg *кобýрá*); 'g' is used where the appearance of a new SF in the GPl creates a three-way SF contrast (eg *го́лoбá*).

The categorisation thus works on three levels: the whole category numbers refer to the *distinctive* level (of SF contrasts); the decimal numbers refer to the *morphemic* level; and the single-letter codes 'N', 'G' and 'g' indicate SF contrasts which occur in the environment of a zero-desinence.

The system of categorisation is summarised in the tables below. The first table lists all the classes and their variants; the SF which has the stress on the earliest syllable is arbitrarily called SF2; word-forms not listed have SF1:

-----  
**Table 3.1** Stress classes in nouns  
 -----

**No SF contrasts:**

<b>Class</b>	<b>Example</b>
1.1	хра́м, ли́па, боло́то
1.2	праща́, очко́

**Two-way SF contrast:**

<b>Class</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>SF2</b>
1.2G	кобура́, торже́ство	GP1
1.2N	сто́л	N/ASg
2.1	го́род, по́ле	All Sg
2.1G	де́ло	All Sg, GP1
2.2	звезда́, село́	All Pl
3	зу́б, у́хо, но́чь	All Sg, N/AP1
4	ноздря́	N/AP1
4G	губа́, плечо́	N/AGP1
4N	гвоздь	N/ASg, N/AP1
5G	рука́	ASg, N/AGP1
6	вода́	ASg, All Pl
7N	ложе́	N/AISg
8N	гру́дь	N/AISg, N/AP1
9	де́ти	NDPP1

**Three-way SF contrast:**

<b>Class</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>SF2</b>	<b>SF3</b>
2.1g	зе́ркало	All Sg	GP1
2.2g	сестра́	NADIPP1	GP1
4g	сковорода́	N/AP1	GP1
5g	голова́	ASg, N/AP1	GP1
6g	земля́	ASg, N/ADIPP1	GP1

-----

The next table lists just the larger categories which are found according to the distinctive approach; the forms given as 'contrasted' could, of course, equally be replaced by those they contrast with:

-----  
**Table 3.2** Contrasted word-forms in noun stress categories  
 -----

Category	Contrasted forms
1	-
2	All Sg
3	All Sg, N/APl
4	N/APl
5	ASg, N/APl
6	ASg, All Pl
7	ISg
8	ISg, N/APl
9	NDPPl

The following codes may be added:

G     GPl also has contrasting SF  
 N     N/ASg also has contrasting SF  
 g     GPl has contrasting, third SF

5 only occurs as 5G and 5g

7 and 8 only occur as 7N and 8N

-----  
 The morphemic stress of the classes is given below.  
 Words of certain declensions will have a zero-desinence in the N/ASg (NSg for animates) or the GPl; where this is so, the table gives the theoretical stress of such word-forms.

-----  
**Table 3.3** Morphemic stress of noun classes  
 -----

**Class 1.1**

-----Sg-----		-----Pl-----	
N	stem	N	stem
A	stem	A	stem
G	stem	G	stem
D	stem	D	stem
I	stem	I	stem
P	stem	P	stem

**Class 1.2**

-----Sg-----  
 N des.  
 A des.  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

-----Pl-----  
 N des.  
 A des.  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

**Class 2.1**

-----Sg-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G stem  
 D stem  
 I stem  
 P stem

-----Pl-----  
 N des.  
 A des.  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

**Class 2.2**

-----Sg-----  
 N des.  
 A des.  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

-----Pl-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G stem  
 D stem  
 I stem  
 P stem

**Class 3**

-----Sg-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G stem  
 D stem  
 I stem  
 P stem

-----Pl-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

**Class 4**

-----Sg-----  
 N des.  
 A des.  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

-----Pl-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

**Class 5**

-----Sg-----  
 N des.  
 A stem  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

-----Pl-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

**Class 6**

-----Sg-----  
 N des.  
 A stem  
 G des.  
 D des.  
 I des.  
 P des.

-----Pl-----  
 N stem  
 A stem  
 G stem  
 D stem  
 I stem  
 P stem

**Class 7**

-----Sg-----

N	des.
A	des.
G	des.
D	des.
I	stem
P	des.

-----Pl-----

N	des.
A	des.
G	des.
D	des.
I	des.
P	des.

**Class 8**

-----Sg-----

N	des.
A	des.
G	des.
D	des.
I	stem
P	des.

-----Pl-----

N	stem
A	stem
G	des.
D	des.
I	des.
P	des.

**Class 9**

-----Sg-----

N	-
A	-
G	-
D	-
I	-
P	-

-----Pl-----

N	stem
A(=G)	des.
G	des.
D	stem
I	des.
P	stem

-----

SF contrasts are found systematically where there are forms with zero-desinences. If one ignores for a moment such SF contrasts, many of which occur 'automatically', since a zero-desinence cannot be stressed, the simplicity of the patterns of SF contrast, and the grammatical distinctions drawn by them, are clearly seen. All but fifty or so nouns follow stress patterns 1 (fixed stress), 2, 3 or 4 (all mobile stress). These three patterns of mobile stress are as follows: an SF contrast of Sg versus Pl (category 2), an SF contrast of the Sg and N/APl versus the rest of the Pl (category 3), and an SF contrast of the N/APl versus all other forms (category 4).

It will readily be seen that this pattern of contrasts can be further reduced to two types: an SF contrast of Sg versus Pl, and an SF contrast of direct cases - N and A - versus oblique cases - G, D, I and P (cf Khazagerov 1973:102-106). This can be seen in the table below; again, the forms given as 'contrasted' could equally be replaced by those they contrast with:



---

**Table 3.4** Contrasting forms in noun categories 2, 3 & 4
 

---

Category	Contrasting forms
2	Pl
3	Pl oblique
4	Pl direct

---

Categories 5 and 6 distinguish the ASg also. Category 5 has the same pattern of SF contrasts as category 4, with the addition of the ASg to the group of contrasting cases; category 6 is like category 2, with the addition of the ASg. These categories can be viewed as a variation on patterns 4 and 2, and account for around forty of the remaining fifty words.

---

**Table 3.5** Contrasting forms in noun categories 5 & 6
 

---

Category	Contrasting forms
5 (= 4 + ASg)	Pl direct & ASg
6 (= 2 + ASg)	Pl & ASg

---

In a similar fashion, categories 7 and 8 represent variations on patterns already encountered, additionally distinguishing the ISg:

---

**Table 3.6** Contrasting forms in noun categories 7 & 8
 

---

Category	Contrasting forms
7 (= 1.2 + ISg)	ISg
8 (= 4 + ISg)	Pl direct & ISg

---

Category 9 uniquely contrasts the SF of the A/GPl and IPl with the SF of the NDPPl.

## Variation

Many nouns may show variation in their stress, of one of two types; they may vary between a pattern of fixed stress and mobile stress, or they may vary in the particular pattern of mobile stress they follow.

This study, necessarily restricted in size, investigates instability of both types in the smaller groups of words with mobile stress, classes 4 to 9. The size of these groups as found in Zal. (calculated in Ilola & Mustajoki 1989), and their size as in the lists further below, found by a comparison of sources and relocation of some words (placed in brackets to the right), is as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.7** Noun stress category sizes  
 -----

Category	Example	No. of words
4	ноздря́	48 (64)
5	рука́	21 (19)
6	вода́	15 (15)
7	ложь	5 (5)
8	гру́дь	4 (3)
9	де́ти	2 (2)
		--- ---
		95 108

-----

The theoretical membership of these groups was established with reference to Red.. Comparison was made with lists contained in Nessel (1994), and some further nouns were also examined as a result of this. In addition, certain feminine nouns, which Dingley (1989) suggests are moving into class 8, are also included, as are all those listed in Red. as having a special locative case word-form (sometimes called the second prepositional form), which Dingley considers could be the 'trigger' for their change of pattern. The locative case word-form is defined as that which follows **в** or **на**, where these prepositions indicate location, not movement; the prepositional case is typically found after the preposition **о**.

Information about the stress of the various word-forms belonging to these lexemes was then gathered from OS, Red., and A&O. Where one or more of these sources indicated the existence of stress variation, or where its existence was demonstrated by disagreement between the sources, word-forms were placed in short sentences and tested in the survey. Where variation was recorded for the DPl, IPl or PPl, generally only one of these three forms was tested, the data for one of these cases being taken as representative of all three; in the case of feminine nouns contrasting the stress of the PSg and the LSg, the cases for which variation was recorded were tested.

Research carried out by Nessel (see Nessel 1994) indicates that there may be variation, even where this is not recorded in standard reference works. It is not clear, however, whether his informants are all speakers of standard literary Russian, and the results of his research are not presented in a form which allows statistical comparison with data from the present study.

In the tables below, items have been re-assigned according to the classification presented above. Some dictionaries place certain lexemes in different classes from those below, and the evidence of the survey indicates that this should, in fact, be so; for the present, however, items are left in the classes assigned to them by Red'kin. If Red'kin places them in more than one class, a single class is chosen below, although no implication should be drawn from the nature of this choice.

The table below shows the nouns assigned by Red'kin to category 4, which demonstrate no variation according to OS, Red., or A&O, and which were not investigated as part of this study; nouns appearing in brackets are compound nouns. It should be noted that the pluralia tantum nouns included in this class by Red'kin, and given in the two lists below, could equally be classified as belonging to class 3, from a synchronic standpoint. Some variant stress forms, which would give a different stress pattern, have been omitted from the lists below; such variation is examined in detail in Chapter 5:

---

**Table 3.8** Category 4 nouns not showing variation
 

---

Lexeme	Gender	Class
вожжа́	f	4
ноздря́	f	4
свеча́	f	4
сопля́	f	4
губа́	f	4G
пята́	f	4G
слеза́	f	4G
просфора́	f	4g
(сорвиголова́)	f	4g
гвоздь	m	4N
червь	m	4N
вѣни	Pl tantum	4
вла́сти	Pl tantum	4
дро́жи	Pl tantum	4
крѣсти	Pl tantum	4
ку́дри	Pl tantum	4
мо́щи	Pl tantum	4
о́воци	Pl tantum	4
са́ни	Pl tantum	4
<del>се́ни</del>	<del>Pl tantum</del>	<del>4</del>
слю́ни	Pl tantum	4

---

The table below shows nouns assigned by Red'kin to class 4, which do demonstrate variation according to OS, Red., or A&O; this group was investigated in the survey. The six nouns at the end of the list were also examined in this study, as Nesset suggests that they either belong to class 4 (са́жѣнь, у́голь, судьба́) or have substandard variants which follow this pattern (во́р, гу́сь, ло́коть). The meanings of all lexemes examined in the survey are given in Chapter 5:

---

 Table 3.9 Category 4 nouns showing variation
 

---

Lexeme	Gender	Class
дежа́	f	4
обжа́	f	4
блоха́	f	4G
волна́	f	4G
гряда́	f	4G
кила́	f	4G
кошма́	f	4G
межа́	f	4G
скирда́	f	4G
скоба́	f	4G
слегá	f	4G
строфа́	f	4G
тропа́	f	4G
щепá	f	4G
плечó	nt	4G
тавро́	nt	4G
железа́	f	4g
копна́	f	4g
просвира́	f	4g
простыня́	f	4g
скамья́	f	4g
серьга́	f	4g
сковорода́	f	4g
слобода́	f	4g
судья́	m	4g
крыльцо́	nt	4g
гру́здь	m	4N
ко́нь	m	4N
клéщи	Pl tantum	4
óтруби	Pl tantum	4
пóмочи	Pl tantum	4
ро́ды	Pl tantum	4
чёрви	Pl tantum	4
бу́бны	Pl tantum	4g
де́ньги	Pl tantum	4g
дрóвни	Pl tantum	4g
по́хороны	Pl tantum	4g
са́жень	f	4g
судьба́	f	4g
во́р	m	4N
гу́сь	m	4N
ло́коть	m	4N
уго́ль	m	4N

---

The next table shows the one lexeme assigned by Red'kin to class 5 which is not subject to variation according to OS, Red., or A&O:

-----  
**Table 3.10** Category 5 nouns not showing variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Class</b>
рукá	f	5G

-----

The rest of the members of class 5 are subject to variation:

-----  
**Table 3.11** Category 5 nouns showing variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Class</b>
горá	f	5G
крохá	f	5G
ногá	f	5G
порá	f	5G
средá	f	5G
стенá	f	5G
строка́	f	5G
щека́	f	5G
болонá	f	5g
бородá	f	5g
борозда́	f	5g
боронá	f	5g
головá	f	5g
доска́	f	5g
полосá	f	5g
скородá	f	5g
сторонá	f	5g

-----

The next table shows Red'kin's class 6 nouns, for which no variation is found according to OS, Red., or A&O:

-----  
**Table 3.12** Category 6 nouns not showing variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Class</b>
дрога́	f	6
душа́	f	6
зима́	f	6
спина́	f	6
весна́	f	6g

-----

The remaining class 6 nouns, for which variation is found, are as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.13** Category 6 nouns showing variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Class</b>
верста́	f	6
вода́	f	6
заря́	f	6
изба́	f	6
коса́	f	6
нора́	f	6
река́	f	6
цена́	f	6
блесна́	f	6g
земля́	f	6g

-----

The next table shows Red'kin's class 7 nouns; no variation is found for these nouns according to OS, Red., or A&O. Stress falls on the stem of the ISg, stem-finally for ЛЮБѠВЬ; the N/ASg (NSg for ВѠШЬ) and ISg are the only forms with a syllabic root for ВѠШЬ, ЛѠЖЬ and РѠЖЬ.

-----  
**Table 3.14** Category 7 nouns not showing variation  
 -----

Lexeme	Gender	Class
ГЛУШЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ЛЮБѠВЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ВѠШЬ	f	7
ЛѠЖЬ	f	7
РѠЖЬ	f	7

-----

Neset (from Zalizniak 1967:166, footnote 56, based on information in Bylinskii 1960) adds the toponyms listed below; these are, however, beyond the scope of the present study:

-----  
**Table 3.15** Category 7 toponyms  
 -----

Lexeme	Gender	Class
КѠТЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ѠБЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ѠМЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ЛѠРМЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
РѠСЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ТВѠРЬ	f, Sg tantum	7
ТОМЬ	f, Sg tantum	7

-----



Zalizniak places **грудь** and the three nouns below in what we have called class 8; the three show variation in one or more of the sources consulted:

-----  
**Table 3.16** Category 8 nouns showing variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Class</b>
грудь	f	8
ось	f	8
степь	f	8

-----

These three and the other third declension feminines listed below are recorded by Red'kin or Nessel as displaying a prepositional-locative contrast of stress. This contrast is thought by some (see Bulakhovskii 1954:162; Kip., p.24; Dingley 1989:5) to be the trigger for innovation in the stress of the Sg. The list thus also includes some words not included in Red'kin's list, but examined by Dingley. The following table shows those for which variation is not recorded by the sources:

-----  
**Table 3.17** 3rd declension f nouns with PSg-LSg contrast, no variation  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Feature</b>
рысь	f, Sg tantum	PSg versus LSg
сень	f, Sg tantum	PSg versus LSg
честь	f, Sg tantum	PSg versus LSg
шерсть	f	PSg versus LSg

-----

The next table shows those for which variation is recorded by one or more of the sources:

-----  
**Table 3.18** 3rd decl. f nouns with PSg-LSg contrast, showing variation  
 -----

Lexeme	Gender	Feature
бро́вь	f	PSg versus LSg
глу́вь	f	PSg versus LSg
го́рсть	f	PSg versus LSg
гря́зь	f	PSg versus LSg
да́ль	f	PSg versus LSg
двѐрь	f	PSg versus LSg
кле́ть	f	PSg versus LSg
ко́сть	f	PSg versus LSg
кро́вь	f	PSg versus LSg
но́чь	f	PSg versus LSg
ма́зь	f	PSg versus LSg
ме́дь	f	PSg versus LSg
ме́ль	f	PSg versus LSg
пе́чь	f	PSg versus LSg
плóть	f	PSg versus LSg
свѣ́зь	f	PSg versus LSg
се́ть	f	PSg versus LSg
те́нь	f	PSg versus LSg
тѣ́шь	f	PSg versus LSg
це́пь	f	PSg versus LSg
ча́сть	f	PSg versus LSg
ще́ль	f	PSg versus LSg
пы́ль	f, Sg tantum	PSg versus LSg

-----

Two nouns form category 9; both show variation:

-----  
**Table 3.19** Category 9 nouns showing variation  
 -----

Lexeme	Gender	Class
де́ти	Pl tantum	9
лю́ди	Pl tantum	9

-----

This concludes our initial examination of variation in noun stress.

## b) Prepositions

In certain combinations of prepositions followed by nouns or numerals, the stress may be displaced from the noun or numeral onto the preposition; the preposition, an otherwise unstressed proclitic, gains main stress, and the noun or numeral, otherwise bearing main stress, becomes unstressed. This movement, with very few exceptions (see below), takes place from a monosyllabic noun or numeral, or from a polysyllabic noun or numeral stressed on its first syllable. Such combinations of stressed prepositions followed by unstressed nouns or numerals will henceforward be called 'preposition + noun/numeral phrases'; this phenomenon is usually referred to in Russian as *перенос ударения на предлог*.

This can be seen as a reversal of the normal roles of 'clitic' and 'non-clitic'. The proclitic preposition has become the carrier of main stress, and the noun or numeral has become an enclitic; the process of de-stressing a noun or numeral after a stressed preposition will henceforth be referred to as 'encliticisation'; it is sometimes referred to in Russian as *энклиза*.

This process can also be seen as a retraction of stress, similar to that occurring in the past and pppS of some prefixed verbs. The similarity between the two processes is underlined by the fact that a great many verbal prefixes are cognate with prepositions, and are historically derived from them.

For this reason, it is interesting to compare the prepositions which may bear the stress in preposition + noun/numeral phrases, and the verbal prefixes which may receive stress in past and pppS of verbs. The following verbal prefixes may be stressed (list based on Ostrogorskaia-Iakshich 1987, with some alterations):

---

**Table 3.20** Verbal prefixes which may be stressed
 

---

во-  
 вы- (always for perf verbs, never for impf)  
 до-  
 за-  
 из-  
 на-  
 над-  
~~о-~~  
 о(б)-  
 от-  
 пере-  
 по-  
 под-  
 при-  
 про-  
 роз-  
 со-  
 у-

---

**Воз-** also occurs as a verbal prefix, but is never stressed.

Prepositions which may be stressed are as follows (list based on Red., with some alterations); the cases they may be followed by when stressed are also listed. As stated earlier (see section 3)a)), the locative case word-form is defined as that which follows **в** or **на**, where these prepositions indicate location, not movement; the prepositional case is typically found after the prepositions **о** or **при** :

---

**Table 3.21** Prepositions which may be stressed, with cases required
 

---

Preposition	Cases required
за	ASg, AP1, ISg
на	ASg, AP1, LSg
по	ASg, AP1, DSg
из	GSg (masculine nouns generally in -y )
без	GSg (masculine nouns in -y )
до	GSg (masculine nouns in -y ), GP1
со	GSg (masculine nouns in -y)
под	ASg, AP1, ISg
<del>о</del>	<del>ASg</del>
о(б)	ASg
от	GSg (masculine nouns in -y )
при	PSg
у	GSg
во	ASg, LSg

---

The table below compares the information in these two tables, and gives all prepositions and verbal prefixes which may be stressed.

---

**Table 3.22** Prepositions and verbal prefixes compared
 

---

Form	Prep.	Stressable	Verbal prefix	Stressable
во	✓	✓	✓	✓
до	✓	✓	✓	✓
за	✓	✓	✓	✓
из	✓	✓	✓	✓
на	✓	✓	✓	✓
<del>о</del>	<del>+</del>	<del>+</del>	<del>+</del>	<del>+</del>
о(б)	✓	✓	✓	✓
от	✓	✓	✓	✓
по	✓	✓	✓	✓
под	✓	✓	✓	✓
при	✓	✓	✓	✓
со	✓	✓	✓	✓
у	✓	✓	✓	✓
без	✓	✓	-	-
над	✓	-	✓	✓
про	✓	-	✓	✓
пере	-	-	✓	✓
роз	-	-	✓	✓
вы	-	-	✓	✓

---

*Twelve*

~~Thirteen~~ forms occur as both 'stressable' verbal prefixes and 'stressable' prepositions:

во  
до  
за  
из  
на  
~~о~~  
об)  
от  
по  
под  
при  
со  
у

Two forms occur as 'stressable' verbal prefixes, but 'unstressable' prepositions:

про  
над

Three forms occur as 'stressable' verbal prefixes but not as prepositions at all:

пере-  
роз-  
вы-

One form occurs as a 'stressable' preposition, but not, genetically, as a verbal prefix:

без

The degree of similarity in terms of 'stressability' is clear; all prepositions which may be stressed in preposition + noun/numeral phrases also occur as stressable verbal prefixes. Only the forms **над** and **про** occur as both prepositions and verbal prefixes, but are stressable only in their latter capacity.

i) Preposition + noun phrases

The nouns which have been identified (by Red., in comparison with other sources) as appearing in preposition + noun phrases are as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.23** Nouns appearing in preposition + noun phrases  
 -----

**Lexeme**

бѣрег  
 бѣок  
 бѣорт  
 бѣрѣвь  
 верста  
 вѣсть  
 вѣтер  
 вѣчер  
 вид  
 вода  
 вѣз  
 вѣлос  
 вѣрот  
 глаза  
 год  
 гѣлос  
 голова  
 город  
 гора  
 двѣрь  
 двѣр  
 дѣнь  
 дѣм  
 доска  
 душа  
 дѣм  
 земля  
 зима  
 зуб  
 кол  
 кон  
 конь  
 коса  
 крик  
 кровь  
 лес  
 лето  
 лѣб  
 люди  
 луг  
 лѣд  
 мир  
 море  
 мѣст

не́бо  
 ни́з  
 нога́  
 но́с  
 но́чь  
 плечо́  
 по́л  
 по́ле  
 по́лдень  
 по́лночь  
 пора́ (до́ сих пор)  
 по́яс  
 река́  
 ро́д  
 ро́т  
 рука́  
 са́д  
 све́т  
 се́рдце  
 сло́во  
 сме́рть  
 сме́х  
 сне́г  
 со́ль  
 со́н  
 спина́  
 стена́  
 сто́л  
 сторона́  
 то́лк  
 уго́л  
 у́с  
 у́хо  
 фи́г  
 щека́  
 щи́  
 це́пь  
 ча́с  
 че́тверть

-----

Generally, stress would be expected to fall on the first syllable of the noun if it were not encliticised (see Zalizniak 1985:21); the only exceptions to this are the preposition + noun phrases *по́ двору*, *по́ столу*, where stress would fall on the noun desinence. The nouns occurring in preposition + noun phrases generally display mobile stress in their paradigms, although for some nouns fixed stress (or variation in its pattern) has developed.

Encliticisation of the noun does not occur in all possible combinations of the prepositions and nouns above,



but only for certain combinations (see Chapter 5). There is variation between speakers, and between different sources, for many such phrases, some stressing the preposition, some the noun; all the phrases for which retraction was recorded in at least one of the sources consulted were examined in the survey.

Preposition + noun phrases are divided in this study into those occurring as part of a larger set-phrase, and those occurring more independently. Thus the preposition + noun phrase *на́ душу* occurs as part of the larger set-phrase *ка́к Бо́г на́ душу поло́жит* 'as the Spirit leads'. In *ле́чь на́ бок* 'to fall down on one's side', and *упа́сть на́ бок* 'to lie on one's side', on the other hand, the preposition + noun phrase occurs more independently; such occurrences can be grouped according to the particular meaning of the preposition, following Zal. (p.72).

Zal. (p.72) points out that stress retraction may only occur for a specific meaning of a preposition + noun phrase (eg *на́ дом* 'to be done at home', eg *взя́ть рабо́ту на́ дом*, but *на до́м* 'onto the house'). He further believes that retraction onto some prepositions (*за, на* and *по* in certain meanings) is less likely to occur where the phrase is further extended in some way (eg *за́ год*, but *за го́д и два́ ме́сяца*).

Zalizniak (1985:21-22) implies a hierarchy, whereby phrases are classed as follows: 'non-lexicalised or weakly lexicalised' (phrase has many possible meanings, and stress is not retracted if the meaning is an abstract or rarely encountered one); 'highly lexicalised' (adverbialised phrases, set-phrases, expressions with one specific meaning); and 'fully lexicalised' (eg *за́муж*).

The use of second genitive ~~and specific locative~~ forms in *-у* for masculine nouns, which may be seen as relic forms in the modern language, implies a high degree of such 'lexicalisation'. However, it proves rather difficult to apply Zalizniak's hierarchy, and divide preposition + noun phrases into those which are 'strongly' and those which are 'weakly' lexicalised. Indeed, contexts where stress would almost certainly not be retracted can be devised for almost

all preposition + noun phrases, except a few very abstract ones.

Some writers (eg Wade 1992:419) believe that certain preposition + noun phrases are typical of colloquial speech. This stylistic factor would account for further variation in the data.

## ii) Preposition + numeral phrases

A process of encliticisation may also occur for numerals in preposition + numeral phrases. The prepositions in question and the case they require in these preposition + numeral phrases are as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.24** Prepositions appearing in preposition + numeral phrases  
 -----

<b>Preposition</b>	<b>Case required</b>
за	A
на	A
под	A
по	A
во	A
до	G
со	G

-----

The following numerals (some cardinal, some collective) have been identified (by OS, in comparison with other sources) as showing retraction onto a preceding preposition:

-----  
**Table 3.25** Numerals appearing in preposition + numeral phrases  
 -----

**Lexeme**

вóсемь  
 двá, двé, двóе  
 дéвять  
 дéсять  
 пýть  
 сéмь  
 сóрок  
 стó  
 трí, трóе  
 шéсть

-----

Once again, the form of the numeral required by the preposition is always stressed on the initial syllable prior to encliticisation. The cases required by the prepositions seems to be unimportant from a phonetic point of view. It will be noted that the numerals are almost always uninflected, since the A form is the same as the N form. The two prepositions requiring the G only occur in certain preposition + numeral phrases with the numeral стó, G стá. Стó also occurs in preposition + numeral phrases with prepositions requiring A, but both A and G word-forms undergo post-tonic vowel reduction when encliticised, and become homophones: [stə].

An examination of various dictionaries (those listed in the summary table) show that a variety of environments are recognised by different dictionaries; listed below and in our summary tables are all the different environments identified. We introduce the following codes to describe the environments; the symbol % is used to indicate a sentence or phrase boundary:

---

**Table 3.26** Key to codes for different preposition + numeral phrases
 

---

<b>Code</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
P+Num+N	preposition + numeral + noun
P+Num%	preposition + numeral (sentence-final)
P+cpdNum	preposition + compound or further defined numeral
P+appNum	preposition + approximate numeral
N+P+Num%	noun + preposition + numeral (sentence-final)

---

Here are examples of each type of environment; due to considerations of space, the survey tested the environments P+Num+N and P+Num% only:

---

**Table 3.27** Examples of different preposition + numeral phrases
 

---

<b>Code</b>	<b>Example</b>
P+Num+N	Раздели́ тóрт на два сегмента́!
P+Num%	Раздели́ э́ту су́мму на два́!
P+cpdNum	Он купи́л во́дку за сорок пя́ть рубле́й. Го́род за де́вять киломе́тров двести́ ме́тров.
P+appNum	Мы́ уе́дем на два-три́ дня́. Мы́ уе́дем на два́ и́ли три́ дня́.
N+P+Num%	Она́ пое́хала ту́да го́да на два́.

---

Zal. (p.73) believes that stress retraction before numerals depends not on the meaning of the prepositions, but the context. The most regular stressing of the preposition will occur in environment P+Num%. Stressing of the preposition is preferred, but less regular, in the environment P+Num+N. Realisations where the preposition is not stressed are also possible for these two environments. In the environment P+cpdNum, retraction does not generally

occur. Both retraction and non-retraction are possible if the numeral is followed by *с полторá* or *с полтіной*.

Once again, full lexicalisation may occur, as is seen in the adverbs *на́двое*, *на́трое*. The numerals *двена́дцать*, *трина́дцать*, *пятна́дцать*, *шестна́дцать*, *семна́дцать*, *восемна́дцать*, *девятна́дцать* and *девяно́сто* also demonstrate lexicalised stress retraction.

This concludes our initial investigation of preposition + noun and preposition + numeral phrases.

### c) Verbs

As stated previously (see introduction to Chapter 3 for examples), the verb is initially divided into stem and (inflectional) desinence; all verb forms are composed of at least these two elements, although the existence of zero-desinences is accepted. Everything preceding the inflectional desinence is considered part of the stem (as in Zal.). Stems consist of at least a root, and perhaps one or more affixes (prefix, infixes, suffixes); the reflexive particle may also be found. If the non-desinential part of a word-form is a root alone, it may still be referred to as a stem in this study. Thus a verb-form may always be initially divided into stem and inflectional desinence.

For simplicity's sake, verbal lexemes are referred to by their infinitive forms, as is traditional. As was indicated in the discussion of the NSg in nouns earlier, however, it is not necessarily implied that this form is hierarchically superior to other word-forms belonging to the same lexeme (although it may often form the basis for analogical change, see Khazagerov 1985:137-55).

It should first be determined which word-forms stand in an inflectional relationship to each other, and which are related by means of derivation. The imperfective and perfective forms of verbs, although clearly related in many senses (semantically, grammatically) are treated here as different lexemes, since they cannot always be related systematically to each other in terms of stress, or seen as synchronically related in terms of their inflection. Where the same stress pattern does apply to the imperfective and perfective, however, as may be <sup>the</sup> case with a perfective verb formed from the imperfective verb by prefixation, the two forms are given together in the following manner: (по)терять.

The three main inflecting parts of the paradigm are the pres/fut (note that this convenient label is used consistently to refer to either present or future, as appropriate), the past and the pppS. These three parts of the verbal paradigm may be referred to as sub-paradigms. Often, a similar patterning is found <sup>the</sup> the stress of the four forms of <sup>with</sup> the

the past sub-paradigm and the four forms of the pppS sub-paradigm; this is examined in detail, for certain verbs, in Chapter 5.

Writers such as Red'kin (see Red.) set out to classify verbal stress patterns by comparing the stress found across all the word-forms belonging to one verbal lexeme. The resulting scheme would be highly complex, and so it is simplified by assigning stress classes according to the pattern occurring in certain word-forms belonging to the pres/fut and past sub-paradigms, and creating subclasses to indicate the stress in other word-forms. One recent study (Schütz 1989), whose approach is largely inspired by that of Red., even ignores the stress properties of non-conjugated verbal word-forms (participles, gerunds and infinitives).

Zal.'s system represents a considerable improvement on this in terms of classificatory simplicity. As in Red., verbs are assigned codes on the basis of the patterns of stress found in the pres/fut and the past sub-paradigms; the two are kept separate, however, by the use of a two-letter classification. The stress of the non-conjugated verbal word-forms is then predicted according to the morphological category to which the verbal lexeme belongs, often simply whether the verb is first or second conjugation.

This approach contrasts, at first sight, with that of writers such as Stankiewicz (1979), Halle (1973), Feldstein (1986), and, in her more recent work, Fedianina (1993). The primary aim of these writers is to account for certain restrictions on the distribution of patterns of mobile stress, which they relate, for example, to the form of the verb-stem, the presence or absence of a suffix vowel. Their approach is different from that found in Zal., and from that of the present study, in that they concern themselves not with the function of mobile stress, but with formal restrictions on it. The findings of these writers, however, are to a certain extent incorporated into the present investigation, and contribute to the development of an economical and accurate classification of mobile stress patterns.

The present study follows the 'distinctive' approach outlined in relation to nouns (see section 3)a) above). Verbs are categorised primarily according to their SF contrasts; different categories are set up for verbs which show contrasts in different sub-paradigms (pres/fut, past, and pppS), or which show different patterns of stress within a certain sub-paradigm. SF contrasts arising between the forms of the pres/fut and those of the past are excluded from consideration, since the two sub-paradigms do not stand in an inflectional relationship with each other; indeed, the past stem is typically formed by the addition of word-derivational suffixes to the root. Moreover, as well as the addition of the past tense suffix in the formation of the past, the root is often subject to further alteration, as can be seen in the example *бег-ý* (1Sg pres/fut) versus *бѣа-л-á* (past f). This type of alteration between sub-paradigms - relatively uncommon in nouns, and very rare in adjectives - is typical of the verbal system.

SF contrasts arising between the pppS and the form from which it is derived are also considered to be subsidiary to the contrasts found within sub-paradigms. One pattern which regularly occurs for some types of verbs is the retraction of stress by one syllable in the formation of the pppS. Here, the SF, as well as the suffix and desinence, is a cue to the fact that the word-form is a pppS form. Whilst not forming the basis of the categorisation of stress patterns, the stress movement occurring in this particular derivational process can be indicated in the stress code given to the verbal lexeme; this is explored in detail further below.

A comprehensive morphological classification of the data is a necessary precursor to any analysis of verbal stress mobility, as can be seen from the work of writers with very different approaches (cf Zal., pp.77-142; Garde 1980:287-366; Fedianina 1993:221; Gladney 1995). The present study makes reference to the morphological classification proposed by Zal., consisting of sixteen basic verb classes. This morphological classification is chosen because it neatly captures many of the distinctions of verbal stem-type which are drawn attention to, albeit expressed in different terms,



by writers such as Townsend (1968), Feldstein (1986) and Fedianina (1993); indeed, many of the insights of these writers are contained implicitly within Zal.'s system.

Stems may differ between the pres/fut, past and pppS sub-paradigms, as well as within these sub-paradigms. The following types of alteration, some of which co-occur, may be identified:

(i) a change of final consonant as a result of palatalisation or final devoicing of obstruents, eg pres/fut 1Sg впр-ý, stem ['vr]- versus 2Sg впр-ёшь, stem ['vɤ]-; past м лёр, stem ['lɔk], versus past ф лер-л-á, where stem consists of [lɔg]- and past suffix -[l]-;

(ii) a change of final consonant as a result of processes of transformational palatalisation, ie consonant mutation (чередование согласных), eg pres/fut 1Sg стриг-ý, stem [stɤ'ɥg]- versus 2Sg стриж-ёшь, stem [stɤ'ɥʒ]-;

(iii) the addition of a word-derivational suffix, eg past ф игра-л-а, with past suffix -[l]-, or pppS пл про-игра-н-ы, with ppp suffix -[n]-;

(iv) the addition of a vocalic element, eg 1Sg говор-ю, stem [gəvʌ'ɣ]- and past м говор-и-л-ø, where the stem consists of [gəvʌ'ɣi]- plus past suffix -[l];

(v) the addition of a consonantal element, eg pres/fut 1Sg кра-д-ý, stem [krʌ'd]- versus past м кра-л, where the stem consists of the root ['kra]- plus past suffix -[l];

(vi) suppletion, eg pres/fut 1Sg бер-ý, stem [bɔ'r]-, versus past м бра-л-ø, where the stem consists of ['bra]- plus past suffix -[l]; pres/fut 1Sg жм-ý, stem ['ʒm]-, versus past м жа-л-ø, where the stem consists of ['ʒa]- plus past suffix -[l]; pres/fut 1Sg ид-ý, where the stem is simply the root [ɔ'd]-, versus past ф ш-л-á, where the stem consists of the root ['ʃ]- plus past suffix -[l]-.

Alterations of type (i) and (ii), which are regular, and often occur automatically, can be disregarded for the purpose of this study. A mutation of the final consonant of the stem may occur where there is fixed stress, eg pres/fut 1Sg стриг-ý, stem [stɤɹ'g]- cf 2Sg стри~~ж~~-ёшь, stem [stɤɹ'ʒ]- or it may coincide with a change in stress, eg pres/fut 1Sg нош-ý, stem [nʌʃ]- versus pres/fut 2Sg но~~с~~ишь, stem ['nʌʃ]-.

Alterations of type (iii) - the presence or absence of word-derivational suffixes - are of great importance in the process of interpreting a series of speech-sounds. They give a clear indication to the hearer of the identity of the form heard, its membership of a particular sub-paradigm. Thus it is considered that SF contrasts occurring in word-derivation, such as the formation of the pppS, are of a secondary nature compared to those arising within the sub-paradigm.

Alterations of types (iv) and (v) are of some importance from the point of view of the distinctive approach. A word-form's membership of a particular sub-paradigm may be established to the hearer by the presence or absence of a particular stem vowel or consonant. Within the sub-paradigm, also, the presence or absence of a ~~stem~~ vowel may indicate the person and number; in the pres/fut of the verb говорить, the ~~stem~~ [gʌvʌ'ɹ]- appears in 1Sg and 3Pl only, whilst the ~~stem~~ [gʌvʌ'ɹɪ]- it is found for the other forms. Stress, however, functions independently of such alterations, drawing no contrasts (as with the pres/fut of говорить above), or contrasting pres/fut 1Sg with the remainder of the pres/fut forms, as exemplified by the verb разделить, 1Sg and 3Pl stem both lacking the thematic vowel -и-, but differing in stress: [rʌzɔɹ'ɹɪ]- versus [rʌ'zɔɹɪɹɪ]-.

the -u-  
considered  
of the  
vowel does  
appear

Changes of type (vi), the appearance of suppletive forms, occur with many verbs, and provide further evidence that it is incorrect to construct a categorisation of verbs on the basis of SF contrasts appearing between forms from different sub-paradigms. The verb брать, for example, contrasts the stem in the infinitive and past, ['bra]-/['bra]-, with the pres/fut stem [bɹ'ɹ]-/[bɹ'ɹ]-. In syllabic terms, however, past f бралá is stressed on the same syllable, counting from the left, as pres/fut 1Sg берý. This coincidence

of syllabic stress is not important, and is disregarded in this analysis.

In the case of берѹ versus бралá (type (vi)), and of крадѹ versus кра́л (type (v)), the most significant cue to the identity of the word-form is the stem used. At the same time, the stress may give further information, or back up the identification of the form. The pres/fut is distinguished from the past primarily by the morphological shape of the stem; having established that the word-form is part of the past sub-paradigm, the SF and/or the desinence may be used to indicate the gender and number. The SF in this instance functions as an additional cue to gender and number, rather than to tense.

### System of stress

It will be recalled that the distinctive approach, as presented in the discussion of nouns above, identifies different stress forms (SFs); the morphemic approach, on the other hand, contrasts desinences with stems. The categorisation of verbs presented here follows the distinctive approach, but is later extended to incorporate elements of the morphemic approach. Examples are given below of both imperfective and perfective verbs; perfective verbs predominate, however, in order to allow comparison with common pppS forms.

The distinctive approach assigns categories on the basis of SF contrasts that occur within the pres/fut, past, or pppS paradigm. The three patterns that are found are as follows:

**Category 1:** no SF contrasts within the pres/fut, past or pppS. Examples: сде́лать, прочита́ть, соса́ть, укра́сть.

pres/fut:        сде́лаю  
                   сде́лаешь  
                   сде́лает

past:            сде́лал  
                   сде́лала  
                   сде́лало

pppS:            сде́лан  
                   сде́лана  
                   сде́лано

**Category 2:** SF contrasts within the past (singling out the past f), sometimes accompanied by SF contrasts within the pppS (singling out the pppS f). Examples: собра́ть, зва́ть, заня́ть.

pres/fut:        зову́  
                   зове́шь  
                   зове́т

past:            зва́л                    зва́ла  
                   зва́ло

pppS:            зва́н                    зва́на  
                   зва́но

**Category 3:** SF contrasts in the pres/fut (singling out the pres/fut 1Sg). Examples: написа́ть, спроси́ть.

pres/fut:        напишу́                    напи́шешь  
   напи́шет

past:            написа́л  
                   написа́ла  
                   написа́ло

pppS:            напи́сан  
                   напи́сана  
                   напи́сано

The past m and pppS m always have zero-desinences. As with zero-desinence forms in nouns, these word-forms may be assigned theoretical stress (see section 3)a) above), which is taken to be that of the past nt or pl, and pppS nt or pl,

respectively. Thus *написа́л* is interpreted as *написа́л-Ø*, by comparison with *написа́ло*, whilst *не́с* is interpreted as *не́с- 'Ø*, with theoretical desinence-stress, by comparison with *несло́*; likewise, *несё́н* is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, by comparison with *несено́*, *гово́рѐн* is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, by comparison with *говорено́*, and *влю́блѐн* is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, by comparison with *влюблено́*. Again, it should be remembered that there is no implication that all word-forms assigned theoretical desinence-stress historically contained a stressed jer. Accepting theoretical stress allows us to place verbs such as *нести́* and *говори́ть* in category 1, beside *сде́лать* and *прочита́ть*, and *влюби́ть* in category 3, beside *написа́ть* and *спроси́ть*.

Information which is captured by a morphemic approach such as Zal.'s can easily be added to our categorisation, by a further division of the three categories described above into different classes. Zal.'s approach assigns a two-letter code, the first letter of which indicates which morpheme or morphemes are stressed in the pres/fut, and the second of which indicates which are stressed in the past. The pattern of stress in the pppS is not reflected in these two-letter codes, and is likewise ignored here for the time being; information relating to which morphemes are stressed in the pppS can be added at a later stage.

Category 1 verbs can be divided into three separate classes:

- **class 1.1** contains verbs with fixed stem-stress in the pres/fut and past, eg *сде́лать*;
- **class 1.2m** contains verbs with fixed desinence-stress in the pres/fut and past, eg *нести́*; the letter 'm' is added to indicate that the SF of the past m has a zero-desinence, and contrasts the SF of the rest of the past;
- **class 1.3** contains verbs with fixed desinence-stress in the pres/fut, and fixed stem-stress in the past, eg *говори́ть*.

Category 2 verbs have desinence-stress in the pres/fut, and mobile stress in the past. Two types of mobility are found in the past, giving two separate classes:

- **class 2** verbs show stress movement in the past between the root and the desinence, eg звáть;
- **class 2Px** verbs show stress movement in the past between the prefix and the desinence, eg заня́ть; the letters 'Px' are added to indicate this.

Category 3 can be renamed **class 3**, since all verbs in this category have mobile stress in the pres/fut and stem-stress in past, eg написа́ть.

The following table summarises which morpheme is stressed in the different word-forms, for each of the six classes. Theoretical stress is referred to for the past m of 1.2m verbs.

-----  
**Table 3.28** Morphemic stress in different verb classes  
 -----

Class	Example	Stem	Desinence
1.1	сде́лать	all	-
1.2m	не́сти	-	all
1.3	гово́рить	past	pres/fut
2	звáть	past m nt pl	pres/fut, past f
2Px	заня́ть	*past m nt pl	pres/fut, past f
3	написа́ть	pres/fut 2Sg+	pres/fut 1Sg

\*stressed on prefix

-----

The following table summarises information as to which forms have SF contrasts within a sub-paradigm:

-----  
**Table 3.29** SF contrasts in different verb classes  
 -----

<b>Class</b>	<b>Example</b>	<b>SF1</b>	<b>SF2</b>
1.1	сдѣлать	-	-
1.2m	нести́	past nt f pl	past m
1.3	говори́ть	-	-
2	звѣ́ть	past m nt pl	past f
2Px	зани́ять	past m nt pl	past f
3	напи́сать	pres/fut 2Sg+	pres/fut 1Sg

-----

Examples of each of the classes, drawn from the morphological tables contained in Zal., are given below:

-----  
**Table 3.30** Verb classes: examples  
 -----

<b>Class</b>	<b>Examples</b>
1.1	вы́-, (с)дѣлать, трѣбовать, трѳнуть, (по)стро́ить, обѣ́деть, (с)прѣ́тать, вы́ить, ду́ть, грѣ́ть, (на)дѣ́ть, достѣ́ть, забы́ть, (про)чита́ть, (по)тере́ть, (на)рисова́ть, (за)тушева́ть
1.2m	(в)нести́, (у)че́сть, (с)бере́чь, перейти́
1.3	гну́ть, (за)ши́ть, пи́ть, мя́ть, жа́ть, соса́ть, поверну́ть, (по)хорони́ть, (за)крича́ть, (по)висѣ́ть, (по)сла́ть, терѣ́ть, ушиби́ть, говори́ть, (о)смоли́ть, (со)круши́ть, (у)томи́ть, (по)щади́ть, (у)кра́сть, стри́чь, (раз)тры́зть, прѣ́сть, пе́ть
2	(со)бра́ть, (со)рва́ть, звѣ́ть, взя́ть, зача́ть, (из)жи́ть, (у)плы́ть, слы́ть, (за)кля́сть
2Px	зани́ять, перѣ́ть, мерѣ́ть, нача́ть, зажи́ть
3	тяну́ть, (на)пи́сать, (у)держа́ть, (рас)смотре́ть, (по)стла́ть, (у)коло́ть, влюби́ть, осуди́ть, разделить

-----

As indicated above, information relating to which morpheme or morphemes are stressed in the pppS should now be added. The pppS is first examined in terms of the patterns of stress that occur in its formation (a derivational process).

The formation of the pppS is often accompanied by a process of stress retraction; verbs forming the pppS in this way are given the code 'r'. This retraction may be of a purely syllabic nature, bearing no relation to the lexeme's morphemic structure; in this case, the stress of the pppS falls one syllable further left (nearer the left word-boundary) than in forms with a similar stem, eg прочитáть - прочи́тан, собра́ть - со́бран. On some occasions, however, the retraction seems to be of a morphemic nature, ~~and~~ stress being retracted from the stem to the first syllable of the prefix, eg пере́нять - пе́ренят (see Ulukhanov 1991).

Most verbs with infinitives in -áть/-я́ть, and most category 3 verbs (that is, those with mobile stress in the pres/fut) show retracted stress in the pppS; a small group of category 3 verbs are exceptional, showing desinence-stress in the pppS, eg влю́бить 3 (1.2m), giving влюбле́на, влюбле́но.

Some writers have suggested that the motivation for stress retraction in the formation of the pppS is to enable a clear distinction between the pppS and the past indicative word-forms (see Khazagerov 1973:107); this is also seen as an opposition between forms expressing the active voice and forms expressing the passive voice (see Khazagerov 1985:106-17). Such contrasts do indeed occur, as can be seen from the following examples прочита́л - прочи́тан, написа́л - напи́сан. For many verbs, however, this is not the case: retraction often does not occur at all, eg забы́л - забы́т, or retraction occurs in both the past and the pppS, eg за́нял - за́нят.

Three patterns of stress are traditionally identified for the pppS sub-paradigm, as exemplified below:

#### 1.1: fixed stem-stress:

сде́лан  
сде́лана  
сде́лано  
сде́ланы



**1.2m:** fixed desinence-stress; the zero-desinence pppS m has a different SF, and is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, indicated by the letter 'm':

несён	несена́
	несено́
	несены́

**2:** desinence-stress in pppS f, contrasting stem-stress in pppS m, nt and pl; the SF of the pppS f contrasts that of the other forms:

зв́ан	звана́
зв́ано	
зв́аны	

Pattern 1.1 may occur where the pppS has been formed by retraction; in this case, the letter 'r' is added to the code, giving 1.1r:

про́читан
про́читана
про́читано
про́читаны

The same pattern 1.1r may be found where stress has been retracted onto the prefix:

со́бран
со́брана
со́брано
со́браны

Pattern 2 also occurs where stress has been retracted onto the prefix, in which case stress falls on the prefix in pppS m, nt and pl, and on the desinence in pppS f; the code 2r is used:

за́нят	занята́
за́нято	
за́няты	

The following table summarises which morpheme is stressed in the different word-forms, for each of the three patterns. Theoretical stress is referred to for the pppS m in pattern 1.2m:

-----  
**Table 3.31** Morphemic stress in different pppS stress patterns  
 -----

Pattern	Example	Stem	Desinence
(1.1)	сдѣлан	all	-
(1.2m)	несѣн	-	all
(2)	звѣн	pppS m nt pl	pppS f

-----

The next table summarises information as to which forms have SF contrasts within the pppS sub-paradigm:

-----  
**Table 3.32** SF contrasts in different pppS stress patterns  
 -----

Pattern	Example	SF1	SF2
(1.1)	сдѣлан	-	-
(1.2m)	несѣн	pppS f, nt, pl	pppS m
(2)	звѣн	pppS m, nt, pl	past f

-----

As stated above, category 2 verbs show stress mobility in the past (singling out the past f), sometimes accompanied by mobility in the pppS (singling out the pppS f). These are the only verbs which may show mobility in the pppS, and thus pattern 2 in the pppS is only found with verbs belonging to classes 2 or 2Px.

The codes referring to the pppS may be placed in round brackets, and given after the verb's stress class number, eg сдѣлать 1.1 (1.1), прочитать 1.1 (1.1r), нести 1.2m (1.2m), договорить 1.3 (1.2m), звать 2 (2), занять 2Px (2r), влюбить 3 (1.2m), написать 3 (1.1r), and so on. An examination of the data contained in Zal. and other sources reveals that there is no obvious correlation between the occurrence of stress retraction in the formation of the pppS and mobility in the sub-paradigms (pres/fut, past, and pppS). This confirms our

assumption that stress mobility in the formation of the pppS is of a different nature to that occurring in the inflected sub-paradigms, being derivational in character.

Only the verbs *е́сть*, *да́ть* and *хоте́ть*, and verbs with these roots, have an irregular pattern of stress contrasts in a sub-paradigm, in this case the pres/fut. The verbs *колеба́ть*, *колыха́ть* (*колы́шу*), and *ажка́ть* (*а́лчу*) stress a different syllable in the pres/fut from that which is expected; *бы́ть*, *гна́ть*, *мо́чь*, *ле́чь*, *приня́ть*, *отня́ть*, and some others with the same roots, have an unusual combination of pres/fut and past patterns, but the pattern within each sub-paradigm is not unusual. The formation of the pppS is unusual in *осве́домить* - *осведомле́н*.

This completes our categorisation of the patterns of stress found in the inflected verbal sub-paradigms.

The corresponding **reflexive** forms of category 1 and category 3 verbs (including their subdivisions) show the same pattern of stress. Reflexive forms of category 2 verbs (including 2Px), however, in contrast to their corresponding non-reflexive forms, often behave like 1.2m verbs in the past, displaying fixed desinence-stress, with certain variations.

The commonest pattern of stress, which will be referred to as pattern i, is as follows: past f, nt, and pl desinence-stressed, and past m stressed on the syllable preceding the reflexive particle. The past m can be assigned theoretical desinence-stress, as in the non-reflexive past m of 1.2m verbs:

- pattern i

продáлся  
продалáсь  
продалóсь  
продали́сь

This is taken as the basic pattern in this study; it is that generally recommended by sources for most category 2 verbs.

Many reflexive category 2 verbs have stem-stressed variants in the past nt and past pl. For some verbs, a stem-

stressed variant is also found for the past f, although this is considered colloquial (see AG §1622). Their pattern is thus as follows:

брáлся  
брáлась  
брáлось  
брáлись

The survey carried out in this study demonstrated that past nt desinence-stress only occurs as a variant if past pl desinence-stress also occurs (see Chapter 5).

The past m of a few verbs is stressed on the reflexive particle, eg занялся, although stem-stressed variants also exist, considered permissible by AG, eg занялся (see AG §1621). For many other verbs, a past m variant stressed on the reflexive particle is considered obsolete (see AG §1621), eg брался, now replaced by брáлся. Variation may even occur in all four forms, as in the verb родиться - родился, родилась, родилось, родились (see AG §1622).

The basic pattern given above, but with the past m always stressed on the reflexive particle, is thought to be original for all pattern 2 verbs when reflexive (see Kip., p.334):

начался  
началась  
началось  
начались

However, this pattern was not found for any of the verbs included in the survey.

Whilst there is no universal agreement as to whether or not the motivation for a verb's particular stress pattern is its inflectional and morphological characteristics, with very few exceptions the stress of the parts of the verbal paradigm not yet discussed can be predicted simply on the basis of whether the verb is first or second conjugation, sometimes with

reference to its stress pattern in the pres/fut, past or pppS sub-paradigms.

Rules for predicting the stress of word-forms belonging to other parts of the paradigm according to their morphological class are generally simple and admit of few exceptions; those given below are largely taken from Zal. (pp.84-86), quoted here with some alterations.

Several important points have been noted by various writers regarding the stress of the **infinitive**, and its relation to the stress of other word-forms. These are summarised below:

- the stress of the infinitive always coincides with the stress of some other verbal form;
- if the verb has fixed stress in all other word-forms, then the infinitive will be stressed on the same syllable as these;
- if the verb has mobile stress in the pres/fut (category 3), then the infinitive will be stressed on the final syllable.

The stress of the infinitive can be linked to that of other forms by saying that it is always stressed like the past nt and pl (normative variants, if there is variation). The only exceptions are as follows:

- the infinitive ends in -чь; the infinitive is stressed on the same syllable as the past m, eg берёт - берёчь; стриг - стрічь;
- class 2Px verbs; the infinitive is stressed one syllable further right than the past m, eg зѧнял - зѧнѧть;
- reflexive class 2 verbs; the infinitive is stressed like the past m, eg рѧлся - рѧться. If the past m is stressed on the reflexive particle -ся, the infinitive

is stressed on the syllable preceding the reflexive particle, ег начался - начатья.

However, there is variation in the past forms of category 2 verbs (see below and Chapter 5).

The stress of the **imperative** is almost always unproblematic, generally falling on the same syllable (from the left) as in the 1Sg pres/fut, ег говорю - говори; читаю - читай; перестану - перестань; зову - зови; даю - давай. The 2Pl imperative is formed by the addition of -те, which does not affect the stress.

The **past gerund** in -в(ши)/-ши and the **past active participle** in -вший/-ший are stressed as the infinitive (see above). If the infinitive is stressed on the desinence -ти, the past gerund and past active participle are stressed on the syllable directly preceding the desinence, ег перенести, перенёсший. Запереть and отпереть are stressed as the past m (but see Chapter 5 for discussion of the past m forms of these verbs).

If the verb is first conjugation, the **present active participle** is, with very few exceptions (ег могуший), stressed as pres/fut 3Sg, ег читать, читает, читающий. If the verb is second conjugation, this form is stressed as the pres/fut 1Sg, ег смотре́ть, смотре́ю, смотре́щий. There is no stress mobility between the different word-forms belonging to the long present active participle.

If the verb is first conjugation, then the **present passive participle** in -ем-/им- is stressed as the pres/fut 1Pl, ег де́лать, де́лаем, де́лаемый. If the verb is second conjugation, then it is stressed as the pres/fut 1Sg or infinitive (although there is no derivational link) ег проси́ть, про́шу, про́симый. Verbs with the suffix -ва- are exceptions, being stressed as the infinitive, ег узнава́ть - узнава́емый. There is

no stress mobility between the different word-forms of the present passive participle, short or long.

Many writers (eg Zalizniak), treating the stress of the past passive participle forms, misleadingly derive first the **past passive participle long form** (pppL), and thence the pppS. This approach must be rejected. The pppL is, in fact, derived from the pppS m, and retains the actual stress of this form, as noted by writers such as Garde (1965) and Feldstein (1986). Even where the pppS m is considered to have theoretical desinence-stress, the pppL retains the actual stress of the pppS m, despite the fact that the pppL has a desinence. For example, the pppS m *окружён* is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, by comparison with *окружёнó*; nevertheless, the stress of the pppL *окружённЫЙ* is the same as the actual stress of the pppS m.

There is no variation in stress between the different word-forms of the pppL. Sometimes the pppL may be adjectivalised, eg pppL *сложённЫЙ*, adjL *сложённЫЙ*. This is an area where stress variation occurs, and is discussed further below.

The **present gerund** in а/я is stressed as the pres/fut 1Sg, eg *смотре́ть, смотре́ю, смотре́я*. The present gerunds of verbs in -дава́ть, -знава́ть, and -става́ть are exceptions, being stressed as the infinitive, eg *дава́ть - дава́я*; the gerunds *ле́жа, сто́я* and *си́дя* are also exceptional, being stressed on the first syllable (see AG §1643). Stress variation occurs for some forms, and this is discussed further below.

To summarise, there are three major patterns of inflectional stress mobility in the verbal system:

- category 3 verbs contrast the SF of the pres/fut 1Sg with the SF of the rest of the pres/fut sub-paradigm, eg *ходи́ть - хожу́ - ходи́шь*;

- category 2 verbs contrast the SF of the past f with the SF of the rest of the past sub-paradigm, eg брать - бралá - бра́ли;
- some category 2 verbs, marked with the pppS code 2, contrast the SF of the pppS f with the SF of the rest of the pppS sub-paradigm, eg заня́ть - за́нят - занята́. This only occurs where there is an SF contrast in the past also.

There is also stress movement found in derivation:

- verbs with the code 'r' retract the stress in the formation of the pppS, compared to forms with a similar stem. Most verbs with infinitives in -а́ть/-я́ть, and most category 3 verbs retract the stress in the pppS.

This concludes our initial examination of stress patterns in verbs.



## Variation

### i) Past indicative

Instability is found in the stress of the past of some category 2 verbs; in particular, stem-stress may be found in place of expected desinence-stress in the past f, and desinence-stress in place of stem-stress in the past nt, and, to a lesser extent, past pl. These category 2 verbs, in their unprefixated infinitive forms, are as follows (see Kip., p.334-37; AG §1615); the meanings of all lexemes examined in the survey are given in Chapter 5:

-----  
**Table 3.33** Category 2 verbs  
 -----

Lexeme	Category
бра́ть	2
бы́ть	2
взя́ть	2
ви́ть	2
вра́ть	2
гна́ть	2
гни́ть	2
да́ть	2
дра́ть	2
жда́ть	2
жи́ть	2
жра́ть	2
зва́ть	2
кля́сть	2
ли́ть	2
лга́ть	2
-ня́ть	2
пи́ть	2
плы́ть	2
рва́ть	2
спа́ть	2
слы́ть	2
нача́ть, зача́ть, поча́ть	2
мере́ть	2
пере́ть	2

-----

To this list may be added the vulgar *спа́ть*, which was not investigated in this study. Certain of these verbs, and some prefixed forms which are derived from them, may show certain

further characteristics, such as stress on the reflexive particle -ся or on the vowel before -сь, and, on occasion, retracted stress onto the negative particle не before the past forms, except the past f (see Kip., p.334).

The following verbs are also assigned past tense mobility (that is, placed in category 2) by at least one of the sources examined in this study:

-----  
**Table 3.34** Verbs which may belong to category 2  
 -----

Lexeme	Category
созда́ть	2
роди́ть (perf)	2
пря́сть	2
тка́ть	2

-----

All the unprefixes verbs listed in the two tables above were examined in the survey, as well as certain of their derived prefixed forms (see below).

The survey clearly demonstrates the emergence of a new pattern in the past for many of the verbs listed above, and their prefixed forms; in particular, a pattern of desinence-stress in the past nt as well as the past f was found to be common. This has been indicated in a verb's stress code by the symbol °, giving the codes 2° and 2Px°.

#### ii) Past passive participle short form

Verbs assigned to category 2 are also susceptible to variation in the stress of the pppS forms. The survey tested such forms for unprefixes verbs, where variation was identified in OS.

In the case of derived prefixed verbs, prefix-stress is generally expected in the past (except past f), but some verbs show stem-stressed variants (see AG §§1616-1619); variation of other types is also found. Individual entries in OS imply that variation is found according to certain

patterns; in each pattern, certain variants are marked correct, others are marked incorrect, obsolescent, permissible, and so on. The different prefixed and unprefixed forms can be grouped according to the pattern of indications given in OS, as shown below. Thus the verb *до́дать*, for example, has the following entry in OS: *до́дал и доп. до́дал, додала́, до́дало, до́дали и доп. до́дало, до́дали; до́дан, доданá и доп. до́дана, до́дано, до́даны; ! не рек. додало́; неправ. додала, додала́, доданы́*. The same indications are given for *зада́ть*, *обда́ть*, *отда́ть*, etc, but a different set of indications are found for *на́дда́ть* and *изда́ть*, and a different set again for *переда́ть*. The various prefixed and unprefixed forms have been grouped below according to these sets of indications. One example of each set was taken for investigation in the survey; the findings for each example should to some extent be representative of other members of the same set. The <sup>h</sup>full data from OS is given further below.

Some verbs are recorded in OS as showing no variation in the past tense; these all have stable stem-stress in the past tense, and were not examined in the survey. Some verbs are recorded as showing no variation in the pppS; these have stable fixed prefix-stress or stem-stress in the pppS, and were also not examined in the survey. Verbs prefixed with stressed *вы́-* have fixed stress, and are excluded from consideration.

-----  
**Table 3.35** Sets of category 2 verbs given same indications in OS  
 -----

#### да́ть

Set a:	да́ть
Set b:	до-, за-, об-, от-, по-, под-, пре-, про-
Set c:	над-, из-
Set d:	пере-
Set e:	при-, раз-

#### созда́ть

Set a:	созда́ть
Set b:	вос-, пере-

зв́ать

Set a: зв́ать  
 Set b: за-, на-, обо-, ото-, по-, подо-, при-, про-, со-  
 Set c: воз-

вр́ать

Set a: вр́ать, со-  
 Set b: на-, пере-, при-

жр́ать

Set a: жр́ать  
 Set b: по-, со-

лѓать

Set a: лѓать, со-  
 Set b: на-, обо-, при-

рв́ать

Set a: рв́ать  
 Set b: взо-, до-, изо-, на- (1), обо-, ото-, пере-, по-, подо-,  
 пре-, про-, разо-, со-, у-  
 Set c: на- (2)

тќать

Set a: тќать  
 Set b: со-, во-, до-, за-, изо-, на-, по-, про-, разо-, со-, у-

бр́ать

Set a: бр́ать  
 Set b: по-  
 Set c: во-, до-, за-, из-, на-, обо-, ото-, пере-, подо-, при-,  
 про-, разо-, со-, у-

др́ать

Set a: др́ать, у-  
 Set b: за-, изо-, на-, обо-, ото-, пере-, по-, про-, разо-, со-

гнать

Set a: гнать

Set b: во-, до-, за-, из-, обо-, ото-, пере-, по-, подо-,  
при-, разо-, со-, у-ждать

Set a: ждать, обо-, подо-

Set b: про-, пере-

спать

Set a: спать, до-, пере-, по-

Set b: про-, за-

начать, зачать, почать

Set a: на-

Set b: за-

Set c: по-

взять

Set a: взять

-нять

Set a: под-, об-, от-, пере-

Set b: при-, за-, на-, по-

Set c: до-, про-

Set d: с-

Set e: у-

клясть

Set a: клясть

Set b: про-

прясть

Set a: прясть

Set b: в-, до-, на-, от-, с-

вѣть

Set a: вѣть  
 Set b: об-, раз- (literal), пере-  
 Set c: раз- (fig.)  
 Set d: за-

жѣть

Set a: жѣть  
 Set b: про-, до-, на-  
 Set c: за-  
 Set d: о-  
 Set e: об-, от-, пере-

лѣть

Set a: лѣть  
 Set b: про-, за-, на-, по-  
 Set c: до-, об-, от-  
 Set d: пере-, под-, при-

пѣть

Set a: пѣть, пере-  
 Set b: до-  
 Set c: про-, от-  
 Set d: за- (1), о-  
 Set e: за- (2)  
 Set f: по-

гнѣть

Set a: гнѣть, до-, за-, из-, от-, пере-, по-, под-, про-, с-

родѣть

Set a: родѣть (perf)  
 Set b: родѣть (impf), воз-, за-, на-, пере-, по-, у-

бѣть

Set a: бѣть, в-, вз-, до-, за-, из-, на-, над-, о-, от-, пере-, по-,  
 под-, при-, про- (1), раз-, с-, у-  
 Set b: про- (2)

бѣть

Set a: бѣть  
 Set b: до-  
 Set c: за-  
 Set d: у-  
 Set e: от-, при-  
 Set f: про-, по-

плѣть

Set a: плѣть, по-  
 Set b: в-, вс-, до-, за-, на-, о-, от-, пере-, под-, при-, про-, с, -у

слѣть

Set a: слѣть, про-

мерѣть

Set a: у-, по-, об-, от-  
 Set b: за-  
 Set c: пере-  
 Set d: мерѣть

перѣть

Set a: за-, от-  
 Set b: в-, до-, на-, по-, при-, про-, рас-, с-, у- (1)  
 Set c: о-  
 Set d: под-, у (2)

---

The data from OS is given in summarised form below. The following abbreviations are used:

-----  
**Table 3.36** Key to abbreviations in summarised OS data, category 2 verbs  
 -----

Meaning	Abbreviation
unprefixed verb	-
stress on prefix	p
stress on root	r
stress on desinence	d
prefix-stress и root-stress	pr
prefix-stress и доп. root-stress	p,r
root-stress доп устар.	(r)
root-stress ! не рек.	[r]
root-stress неправ.	<r>
root-stress грубо неправ.	<<r>>

-----

The data contained in OS is shown in the table below:

-----  
**Table 3.37** Summarised OS data on category 2 verbs  
 -----

дАТЬ

	-	до, за, об, от, по, под, пре, про	над, из	пере <sup>1</sup>	при, раз <sup>2</sup>
-дал	r	p,r	r	r	r(p)
-дала	d<r>	d<p><r>	d<r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>
-дало	dr	p,r[d]	r[d]	r[d]	r(p)[d]
-дали	r	p,r	r	r	r(p)
-дан	r	p	p	p	p
-дана	d	d,p	d,p	d,p	d,p
-дано	d	p	p	p	p
-даны	d	p<d>	p<d>	p<d>	p<d>

<sup>1</sup>p = пере; пере occurs, marked неправ., for all eight forms

<sup>2</sup>p = рóz



созда́ть

	-1	вос <sup>1</sup> , пере <sup>1</sup>
-создал	p, r	r
-создала	d<p><r>	d<r>
-создало	p, r[d]	r[d]
-создали	p, r	r
-создан	p	p
-создана	d, p	d, p
-создано	p	p
-созданы	p<d>	p<d>

<sup>1</sup>p = соз-, r = да-

звáть

	-	за, на, обо, ото, по, при, про, со	воз
-звал	r	r	r
-звала	d<r>	d<r>	r
-звало	r[d]	r[d]	r
-звали	r	r	r
-зван	r	p	
-звана	d	p(d)	
-звано	r	p	
-званы	r	p	

вра́ть

	-, со	на, пере <sup>1</sup> , при,
-врал	r	r
-врала	d<r>	d<r>
-врало	r[d]	r[d]
-врали	r	r
-вран		p
-врана		p
-врано		p
-враны		p

<sup>1</sup>p = пере́

жр́ать

	-	по, со
- жрал	r	r
- жрала	d<r>	d<r>
- жрало	r[d]	r[d]
- жрали	r	r
- жран		p
- жрана		p
- жрано		p
- жраны		p

лѓать

	-, со	на, обо, при
- лгал	r	r
- лгала	d<r>	d<r>
- лгало	r[d]	r[d]
- лгали	r	r
- лган		p
- лгана		p
- лгано		p
- лганы		p

рв́ать

	-	взо, до, изо, на (1), обо, ото, пере <sup>1</sup> , по, подо <sup>1</sup> , пре, про, разо <sup>1</sup> , со, у	на (2)
- рвал	r	r	r
- рвала	d<r>	d<r>	d<r>
- рвало	r[d]	r[d]	r, d
- рвали	r	r	r
- рван		p	
- рвана		p	
- рвано		p	
- рваны		p	

нарв́ать (1) 'to pick a quantity of something'  
 нарв́ать (2) 'to fester, suppurate'

<sup>1</sup>p = перé, подó, разó

тка́ть

	-	со, во, до, за, изо <sup>1</sup> , на, по, про, разо <sup>1</sup> , со, у	
-ткал	r	r	
-ткала	d, r	d, r	
-ткало	r[d]	r[d]	
-ткали	r	r	
-ткан		p	
-ткана		p	
-ткано		p	
-тканы		p	

<sup>1</sup>p = изо́, разо́

бра́ть

	-	по	во, до, за, из, на, обо <sup>1</sup> , ото <sup>1</sup> , пере <sup>1</sup> , подо <sup>1</sup> , при, про, разо <sup>1</sup> , со, у
-брал	r	r	r
-брала	d<r>	d<r>	d<r>
-брало	r[d]	r[d]	r[d]
-брали	r	r	r
-бран		p	p
-брана		p	p(d)
-брано		p	p
-браны		p	p

<sup>1</sup>p = обо́, ото́, пере́, подо́, разо́

дра́ть

	-, у	за, изо, на, обо <sup>1</sup> , ото <sup>1</sup> , пере <sup>1</sup> , по, про, разо <sup>1</sup> , со	
-драл	r	r	
-драла	d<r>	d<r>	
-драло	r[d]	r[d]	
-драли	r	r	
-дран		p	
-драна		p	
-драно		p	
-драны		p	

<sup>1</sup>p = обо́, ото́, пере́, разо́

гнать

	-	во, до, за, из, обо <sup>1</sup> , ото <sup>1</sup> , пере <sup>1</sup> , по, подо <sup>1</sup> , при, разо <sup>1</sup> , со, у
-гнал	r	r
-гнала	d<r>	d<r>
-гнало	r[d]	r[d]
-гнали	r	r
-гнан		p
-гнана		p
-гнано		p
-гнаны		p

<sup>1</sup>p = обó, отó, перé, подó, разо́

ждать

	-, обо, подо	про, пере <sup>1</sup>
-ждал	r	r
-ждала	d<r>	d<r>
-ждало	r[d]	r[d]
-ждали	r	r
-ждан		p
-ждана		p
-ждано		p
-жданы		p

<sup>1</sup>p = перé

спать

	-, до, пере, по	про, за
-спал	r	r
-спала	d<r>	d<r>
-спало	r[d]	r[d]
-спали	r	r
-спан		p
-спана		p
-спано		p
-спаны		p

-ЧАТЬ

	на	за	по (obsolete/dialectal)
-чал	p<<r>>	r	r
-чала	d<p><<r>>	d<r>	d<r>
-чало	p[d]<<r>>	r	r
-чали	p<<r>>	r	r
-чат	p<r>	r	r(p)
-чата	d[p]<r>	d,r	dr
-чато	p<r>	r	r(p)
-чаты	p<r>	r	r(p)

ВЗЯТЬ

	-
взял	r
взяла	d<r>
взяло	r,d
взяли	r
взят	r
взята	d
взято	r<d>
взяты	r<d>

-НЯТЬ

	под, об, от пере <sup>1</sup>	при, за, на	по	до, про	с	у
-нял	p,r	p<r>	p<<r>>	p<r>	r	r
-няла	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<p><<r>>	d<p><r>	d<r>	d<r>
-няло	p,r[d]	p[d]<r>	p<<r>>	p[d]<r>	r[d]	r[d]
-няли	p,r	p<r>	p<<r>>	p<r>	r	r
-нят	p<r>	p<r>	p<<r>>	p<r>	r	r
-нята	d[p]<r>	d[p]<r>	d[p]<<r>>	d[p]<r>	d[r]	d[r]
-нято	p<r>	p<r>	p<<r>>	p<r>	r<d>	r
-няты	p<r>	p<r><d>	p<<r>>	p<r>	r<d>	r

<sup>1</sup> p = пере; пере variant occurs marked неправ. for all eight forms

клясть

	-	про
-клял	r	p<r>
-кляла	d<r>	d<p><r>
-кляло	r[d]	p[d]<r>
-кляли	r	p<r>
-клят		p<r>
-клята		d[p]<r>
-клято		p<r>
-кляты		p<r>

прясть

	-	в, до, на, от, с
-прял	r	r
-пряла	d, r	r, d
-пряло	r	r
-пряли	r	r
-пряден		dr
-прядена		dr
-прядено		dr
-прядены		dr

вить

	-	об, пере раз (lit.)	раз (fig.)	за
-вил	r	r	r<p>	r
-вила	d<r>	d<r>	d<r><p>	d<r>
-вило	r	r	r<p>	r
-вили	r	r	r<p>	r
-вит		r	pr	pr
-вита		d, r	d[p] [r]	d[p] [r]
-вито		r	pr	pr
-виты		r<d>	pr<d>	pr<d>

жить

	-	про, до, на	за	о	об, от, пере (l) <sup>1</sup>
-жил	r	p, r	p, r	p[r]	pr
-жила	d<r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>
-жило	r[d]	p, r[d]	p, r[d]	p[d] [r]	pr[d]
-жили	r	p, r	p, r	p[r]	pr
-жит		p, r			pr
-жита		d[p] [r]			d[p] [r]
-жито		p, r			pr
-житы		p, r			pr

пере (2)<sup>1</sup>

-жил	r(p)
-жила	d<p><r>
-жило	r(p)[d]
-жили	r(p)
-жит	r
-жита	d[r]
-жито	r
-житы	r

пережить (1) 'to experience'

пережить (2) 'to live through, outlive'

<sup>1</sup>p = pére; перé occurs, marked неправ., for all eight forms

лѣть

	-	про, за, на, по	до, об, от	пере, под, при
-лил	r	p, r	pr	r
-лила	d<r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<r>
-лило	r[d]	p, r[d]	pr[d]	r[d]
-лили	r	p, r	pr	r
-лит		p, r	pr	r
-лита		d[p][r]	d[p][r]	d[r]
-лито		p, r	pr	r
-литы		p, r<d>	pr<d>	r<d>

пѣть

	-, пере	до	про, от	за (1), о	за (2)	по
-пил	r	pr	pr	r	p	pr
-пила	d<r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<r>	d<p>	d<p><r>
-пило	r	pr[d]	pr	r	p	pr
-пили	r	pr	pr	r	p	pr
-пит		pr	pr	r		pr
-пита		dr[p]	dr[p]	dr		dr
-пито		pr	pr	r		pr
-питы		pr	pr	r		pr

запить (1) 'to wash something down'

запить (2) 'to take to drink'

гнѣть

-, до, за, из, от, пере, по, под, про, с

-гнѣл	r
-гнѣла	d<r>
-гнѣло	r[d]
-гнѣли	r

родѣть

- (perf)      - (impf), воз, з, на, пере, по, у

-родѣл	r	r
-родѣла	d<r>	r
-родѣло	r[d]	r
-родѣли	r	r

No variation in the following:

-рождѣн  
 -рождѣна  
 -рождѣно  
 -рождѣны

бѣть

-, в, вз, до,      про (2)  
 за, из, на, над,  
 о, от, пере, по,  
 под, при, про (1),  
 раз, с, у

-бѣл	r	pr
-бѣла	r	r
-бѣло	r	pr
-бѣли	r	pr
-бѣт	r	
-бѣта	r	
-бѣто	r	
-бѣты	r	

пробѣть (1) 'to make a hole through'  
 пробѣть (2) 'to strike (a time, an hour)'



быть

	-	до	за	у	от, при	pro, po
-был	r	r(p)	r	p<r>	p[r]	p, r
-была	d	d[r]	r	d<p><r>	d<p><r>	d<p><r>
-было	r	r(p)	r	p<r>	p[r]	p, r
-были	r	r(p)	r	p<r>	p[r]	p, r
-быт		r, p	r			
-быта		r	r			
-быто		p, r	r			
-быты		p, r	r			

плыть

	-, по	в, вс, до, за, на, о, от, пере, под, при, про, с, у
-плыл	r	r
-плыла	d<r>	d<r>
-плыло	r[d]	r[d]
-плыли	r<d>	r

слыть

	-, про
-слыл	r
-слыла	d<r>
-слыло	r[d]
-слыли	r

мереть

	у, по, об, от	за	пере <sup>1</sup>	-
-мер	p	p	p, r	r
-мерла	d<p>	d<p>	d[r]	r
-мерло	p[d]	p[d]	p, r	r
-мерли	p<d>	p	p, r	r

<sup>1</sup> p = pére

переть

	за, от	-, в, до, на, по, при, про, рас, с, у (1),	о	под, у (2)
-пер	p	r	r	r
-перла	d<p>	r	dr	r[d]
-перло	p<d>	r	r	r
-перли	p<d>	r	r	r
-перт	p	r	r	r
-перта	d<p>	r	dr	r[d]
-перто	p	r	r	r
-перты	p	r	r	r

упереть (1) 'to steal'

упереть (2) 'to give strong support'

iii) Past indicative of reflexive verbs

Category 2 verbs are susceptible to variation in the past forms of their corresponding reflexive verbs (AG-§§1615, 1620-21); there are, of course, no pppS forms. Evaluation of the status of variants differs from source to source, and verb to verb; AG considers stem-stressed f variants colloquial, whilst stem-stressed nt and pl variants for some verbs are either equal or colloquial alternatives. Again, on the basis of the information in OS, representative examples were chosen for further examination in the survey; this information is summarised below. The full information contained in individual entries in OS is presented further below.

It should be noted that the following verbs are the only ones for which no variation is recorded; they are marked as having stable fixed stem-stress in past, and were consequently not examined in the survey:

- биться and all prefixed forms;
- родиться (except perf) and prefixed forms;
- переться and all prefixed forms (except за-(1) 'to lock oneself in' and под-).

No reflexive forms are listed in OS for -пряться, -лнить, -слыть, and -мереть.

-----  
**Table 3.38** Sets of category 2 refl've verbs with same indications in OS  
 -----

даться

Set a:       даться  
 Set b:       за-, об-, от-, по-, под-, пре-, про-, пере-  
 Set c:       раз-

создаться

Set a:       создаться, вос-

зваться

Set a:       зваться, до-, на-, ото-, про-, со-

-вратся

Set a:       до-, за-, изо-, про-

-жратся

Set a:       за-, на-, обо-

-лгаться

Set a:       за-, изо-

рваться

Set a:       рваться, во-, взо-, до-, за-, изо-, на-, надо-, обо-, ото-,  
 пере-, подо-, по-, пре-, разо-, со-, у-  
 Set b:       про-

ткаться

Set a:       ткаться

б́раться

Set a: б́раться, во-, до-, за-, на-, пере-, подо-, при-, про-,  
разо-, со-, у-

дра́ться

Set a: дра́ться, за-, изо-, на-, обо-, ото-, пере-, по-, про-,  
разо-, со-

гна́ться

Set a: гна́ться, у-

-жда́ться

Set a: до-, за-

спа́ться

Set a: спа́ться  
Set b: за-, на-, ото-, про-  
Set c: разо-

нача́ться

Set a: нача́ться

взя́ться

Set a: взя́ться

-ня́ться

Set a: об-, от-, под-  
Set b: за-, на-, при-  
Set c: у-

кля́сться

Set a: кля́сться, по-  
Set b: за-

ви́ться

Set a: ви́ться, вз-, за-, из-, на-, об-, пере-, под-, раз-, с-

житься

Set a: житься  
 Set b: в-, при-, раз-, с-, у-  
 Set c: за-, на-, об-

литься

Set a: литься, в-, из-, пере-, под-, раз-, с-  
 Set b: до-, за-, на-, об-, по-, про-

питься

Set a: питься, в-, до-, на-, о-, пере-, с-, у-  
 Set b: про-

родиться

Set a: родиться (perf)  
 Set b: родиться (impf), воз-, за-, на-, пере-, раз-, у-

биться

Set a: биться, до-, за-, из-, на-, от-, пере-, по-, при-, про-,  
 раз-, с-

сбыться

Set a: сбыться

-плыться

Set a: раз-  
 Set b: с-

переться

Set a: переться, в-, до-, за- (2), на-, по-, при-, про-  
 Set b: за- (1)  
 Set c: под-

---

The data from OS is given in summarised form below. Abbreviations are as above, with the addition of the following:

-----  
**Table 3.39** Key to abbreviations in summarised OS data, reflexive verbs  
 -----

Meaning	Abbreviation
stress on ся́	ся́
stress on root <i>и доп. устар.</i> on ся́	r(ся́)
stress on ся́ <i>и</i> stress on root	ся́ r
stress on ся́ <i>и доп.</i> stress on root	ся́, r

-----

The data from OS is as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.40** Summarised OS data, reflexive verbs  
 -----

да́ться

	-	за, об, от, по, под, пре, про, пере <sup>1</sup>	раз
-дался	r(ся́)	r(ся́) <p>	r(ся́)
-далась	d	d<r><p>	d<r>
-далось	d, r	d, r<p>	d, r
-дались	d, r	d, r<p>	d, r

<sup>1</sup>пере; пере́ occurs, marked неправ., for all four forms

созда́ться

	- <sup>1</sup> , вос
-создался	r <sup>2</sup> (ся́)
-создалась	d<r>
-создалось	d, r
-создались	d, r

<sup>1</sup> variants with со́з-, marked неправ., are also given.

<sup>2</sup> r = создал-

зв́аться

-, до, на, ото, про, со

-звался	r(с́я)
-звалась	d<r>
-звалось	d, r
-звались	d, r

-вра́ться

до, за, изо, про

-врался	r(с́я)
-вралась	d<r>
-вралось	d, r
-врались	d, r

-жр́аться

за, на, обо

-жрался	r(с́я)
-жралась	d<r>
-жралось	d, r
-жрались	d, r

-лѓаться

за, изо

-лгался	r
-лгалась	d<r>
-лгалось	rd
-лгались	rd

рв́аться

-, во, взо, до, за, изо, на, надо, обо, ото, пере, подо, по, пре, разо, со, у про

-рвался	r(с́я)	r(с́я)
-рвалась	d<r>	d[r]
-рвалось	d, r	d, r
-рвались	d, r	d, r

тка́ться

-

ткался	r
ткалась	d, r
ткалось	d, r
ткались	d, r

бра́ться

-, во, до, за, на, пере, подо, при, про, разо, со, у

-брался	r(с́я)
-бралась	d<r>
-бралось	d, r
-брались	d, r

дра́ться

-, за, изо, на, обо, ото, пере, по, про, разо, со

-дрался	r(с́я)
-дралась	d<r>
-дралось	d, r
-дрались	d, r

гна́ться

-, у

-гнался	r(с́я)
-гналась	d<r>
-гналось	d, r
-гнались	d, r

-жда́ться

до, за

-ждался	r(с́я)
-ждалась	d<r>
-ждалось	d, r
-ждались	d, r



спáться

	-	за, на, ото, про	разо
-спался	-	r	r
-спалась	-	d<r>	d
-спалось	d[r]	rd	rd
-спались	-	rd	rd

начáться

начался	сЯ <r><p>
началась	d<r><p>
началось	d<r><p>
начались	d<r><p>

взýться

взялся	r(сЯ)
взялась	d<r>
взялось	d, r
взялись	d, r

-нýться

	об, от, под	за, на, при	у
-нялся	сЯ r<p>	сЯ, r<p>	r(сЯ)
-нялась	d<r><p>	d<r><p>	d<r>
-нялось	d, r<p>	d[r]<p>	d, r
-нялись	d, r<p>	d[r]<p>	d, r

кля́ться

	-, по	за
-клялся	r(сЯ)	r
-клялась	d<r>	d[r]
-клялось	d, r	r
-клялись	d, r	r

вй́ться

	-, вз, за, из, на, об, пере, под, раз, с
-вился	r(сЯ)
-вилась	d<r>
-вилось	d, r
-вились	d, r

жѣться

	-	в, при, раз, с, у	за, на, об
-жился	-	r(сѣ)	r(сѣ) <p>
-жилась	-	d<r>	d<r><p>
-жилося	d[r]	d, r	d, r<p>
-жились	-	d, r	d, r<p>

лѣться

	- , в, из, пере, под, раз, с	до, за, на, об, по, про
-лился	r(сѣ)	r(сѣ) <p>
-лилась	d<r>	d<r><p>
-лилося	d, r	d, r<p>
-лились	d, r	d, r<p>

пѣться

	- , в, до, на, о, пере, с, у	про
-пился	r(сѣ)	r(сѣ) <p>
-пилась	d<r>	d<r><p>
-пилося	d, r	d, r<p>
-пились	d, r	d, r<p>

родѣться

	- (perf)	- (impf) , воз, за, на, пере, раз, у
-родился	сѣ r	r
-родилась	d, r	r
-родилось	d, r	r
-родились	d, r	r

бѣться

	- , до, за, из, на, от, пере, по, при, про, раз, с
-бился	r
-билась	r
-билось	r
-бились	r

сбы́ться

сбылся	r(с́я)
сбылась	d<r>
сбылось	d[r]
сбылись	d[r]

-плы́ться

	рас	с
-плылся	r(с́я)	r(с́я)
-плылась	d<r>	d
-плылось	d, r	d, r
-плылись	d, r	d, r

перё́ться

	-, в, д о, за (2), на, по, при, про	за (1)	под
-перся	r	с́я [p]	r
-перлась	r	d<p>	r[d]
-перлось	r	d[p]	r[d]
-перлись	r	d[p]	r[d]

заперё́ться (1) 'to lock oneself in'

заперё́ться (2) 'to be obstinate'

-----

iv) Adjectivalisation of past passive participle long form

Adjectivalised pppL forms may be differentiated from their corresponding participial forms by various means, including stress. Foug. (p.36) identifies around 125 examples of adjectivalised pppL forms which differ from their corresponding participles, and four further examples with variants that show a difference of stress. Of these, only the examples below provide identical word-forms which may be differentiated by stress alone when written; for these examples, syntactic differences are correlated with a contrast of SFs. This can be demonstrated with two sentences: верё́вка, ви́тая ма́мой, лежа́ла там, with SF ['yít]- for the pppS f; contrasting ви́тая ле́стница ве́ла на́вёрх, with SF [yú't]- for the adjS f.

It should be noted that examples where there is a vowel change as well as a stress contrast could be included in the investigation since, in the case of differences in desinence vowel, this is only found in the adjL m (eg заві́тый versus завітóй ), and a different form was therefore tested, eg завитая. In the case of differences in other vowels, ё generally appears in print as е; this convention was followed to advantage in the survey, informants supplying [e] or [o] as they considered appropriate on reading the test sentence.

The tables below were compiled on the basis of information contained in Foug. (pp. 28, 37-39, 57, 153), in comparison with AG, the four-volume *Slovar' russkogo iazyka* (1957-61, Foug.'s primary source), and Ushakov (1935-40). The following forms are differentiated by stress only:

-----  
**Table 3.41** PppL & adjL differentiated by stress alone  
 -----

**pppL**

пре́зренный  
 про́клятый

**adjL**

пре́зренный  
 прокля́тый

-----

The following are differentiated by stress and vowel:

---

**Table 3.42** PppL & adjL differentiated by stress and vowel

---

**pppL**

**adjL**

- stem vowel affected:

пеклѐванный

пеклевáнный

- desinence vowel in adjL m affected:

вѣ́тый

завѣ́тый (завѣ́т-о-ы, завѣ́та)

за́нятый

на́нятый

о́бжитый

о́тпертый

ра́звитый (ра́звѣ́т-о-ы, развитá)

сня́тый

вѣтѡ́й

завѣтѡ́й (за́вѣт-о-ы, завѣ́та)

занѣ́тѡй

нанѣ́тѡй

обжитѡ́й

отпертѡ́й

развитѡ́й (ра́звѣ́т-о-ы, развитá)

сня́тѡй

на́литый

про́питый

налѣ́тѡй

пропитѡ́й

- suffix vowel affected:

заслу́женный

засо́ленный

сло́женный (сло́жен-а-о-ы)

уни́женный (уни́жен-а-о-ы)

заслужѣ́нный

засолѣ́нный

сложѣ́нный (сложѣ́н-а́-о́-ы́)

унижѣ́нный (унижѣ́н, унижѣ́нна-о-ы́)

---

All of the above were tested in the survey. Each word-form was tested in two environments, to see whether the pppL versus adjL distinction was, in fact, upheld in the language.

AG (1980:§§ 1631, 1634, 1635) indicates variation in stress without differentiation of syntactic function for the three lists of examples below; these words were not examined in the survey:

---

**Table 3.43** Variation in pppL, no differentiation of syntactic function

---

о́крово́авленный, о́кровоавле́нный  
 о́све́домленный, о́сведомле́нный  
 вс- за- на- пе́енный, -пенённый, -пенённый  
 разгро́мленный, разгрома́нный  
 раздво́енный, раздвоённый  
 за- пере- по- раз-золо́ченный, -золоче́нный  
 ис- пере-ко́шенный, -коше́нный  
 изреше́ченный, изрешече́нный  
 затве́рженный, затверже́нный  
 за- пере-дра́зненный, -дразнённый  
 вскормле́нный, вскормлённый  
 пере- по- под- при- с- у-ма́енный, -манённый  
 про́йденный, пройде́нный  
 на́йденный, найдённый

- same variation in stress is found in the pppS m, from which the pppL is derived:

до́бытый  
 до́житый  
 обви́тый, обвити́й  
 зави́тый, завити́й (functional difference according to Foug.)  
 ра́звитый, разви́й (but разви́тый is an adj only)  
 приви́тый, привити́й  
 о́бжитый  
 изжи́тый, изжити́й

на́житый, нажити́й  
 пе́режитый, пережити́й  
 при́житый, прижити́й  
 про́житый, прожити́й  
 за́литый, залити́й  
 про́литый, пролити́й

до́литый  
 о́блитый  
 о́тлитый  
 разли́тый, разлито́й  
 до́пityй  
 о́тпityй  
 про́пityй

- variation in stress is found in the pres/fut forms also:

-кли́ненный, -клине́нный  
 -опоро́женный, -опорожнённый  
 у́меньшенный, уменьшённый  
 усугу́бленный, усугублённый  
 -гру́женный, -грузнённый  
 погру́женный, погружённый  
 -кру́женный, -кружённный  
 взма́ненный, взманённый  
 лу́женный, лужённый  
 -пру́женный, -пружённный  
 заря́женный, заряжённый  
 нату́женный, натружённый  
 -пря́денный, -прядённый  
 -се́ченный, -сечённый

---

#### v) Present gerund

It was stated above that the present gerund in а/я is stressed as the pres/fut 1Sg, with the exception of verbs in -дава́ть, -знава́ть, and -сва́вать and the gerunds ле́жа, сто́я and си́дя (see AG §1643). Some present gerunds may also function as adverbs (eg молча), and others may occur in quasi-prepositional phrases or set-phrases (eg судя по, глядя по, на ночь глядя); occasionally sources indicate a difference of stress according to the word-form's syntactic function. Thus a contrast of SFs may appear in the sentences сۇдя по пого́де, мы́ сходи́м и́ли в па́рк, и́ли в кино́, with SF ['sʊdʲ]- compared with судя́ люде́й знако́мых и незнако́мых, о́н пропу́ска́л себя́ че́рез са́мое ме́лкое си́то (example from Dimitrova 1994:38), with SF [sʊ'dʲ]-. The opposition of SFs creates a phonetic cue to the syntactic distinction between the two forms.

The following word-forms, which have unexpected stem-stress, were tested in the survey, to see if variation occurred:

---

**Table 3.44** Present gerunds with unexpected stem-stress
 

---

Lexeme	Pres/fut 1Sg	Present gerund
лежа́ть	лежу́	ле́жа
сиде́ть	сиджу́	си́дя
сто́ять	стою́	сто́я

---

Variation, potentially related to syntactic function, is recorded in sources for the following word-forms, also tested in the survey:

---

**Table 3.45** Present gerunds with stress variation
 

---

**Word-form**

гля́дя  
полуле́жа  
молча́  
судя́  
хотя́

---

The form *хотя́* appears as a conjunction, with the same stress as is expected for the gerund; however, the adverb *не́хотя* (written as one word, with stress on the negative particle), should form a contrast with the gerund *хотя́* preceded by the negative particle, viz *не́хотя́*, and this was tested in the survey. From a phonological point of view, *не́хотя́* and *не́хотя* are both single words, because the negative particle *не́* must be followed by a word, with which it must form a phonological unit. The gerunds *судя́* and *гля́дя*, as mentioned above, also occur in quasi-prepositional phrases followed by the preposition *по́*.

The word-forms in both lists were tested in two differing syntactic environments: first, where possible, in a purely gerundial use; and second, as adverbs or in quasi-prepositional phrases, as applicable. In this way it was investigated whether a distinction in syntactic function was accompanied, for these forms, by a distinction in SFs.



### vi) Other variation

The areas below have not been included in the present study, generally either because they have been treated extensively elsewhere, or because the variation found reflects variation found in parts of the paradigm which have been investigated.

Variation is found in the pres/fut of certain 2nd conj **verbs in -ить**, such as звонить. These show instability between a class 3 pattern (звоню́ - звони́т) and a class 1.3 pattern (звоню́ - звони́т). This area is treated rather fully by several writers (eg Vorontsova 1959, 1979; Kip., pp.299-319; Krysin 1974:224-65; Gorbachevich 1978:99-104; Fedianina 1976:228-30).

AG records variation in the **present active participle** for a small group of verbs (AG §1626), eg хваля́щий beside хваля́щий. If there is a corresponding reflexive participle, it will have the same stress as the non-reflexive variant where stress falls later in the word. The forms in question are as follows:

---

**Table 3.46** Present active participles with stress variation

---

#### **Word-form**

бе́лящий	
бе́сящий	
ва́лящий	
ва́рящий	
га́сящий	
да́вящий	
де́лящий	
дра́знящий	
дру́жащий	(no reflexive form)
ко́пящий	
су́дящий	
ту́жащий	(no reflexive form)
хва́лящий	

---

There is a difference of stress between reflexive and non-reflexive participles for лу́пящий - лупя́щийся, мо́чащий - моча́щийся, and та́щащий - таща́щийся. Ле́нящийся shows variation as marked.

Variation is recorded for the **past active participle** and **past gerund** of some verbs (see AG §1628, OS), eg *зámерший* beside *замёрший*. AG gives the following examples, although OS identifies variation for other verbs also:

---

**Table 3.47** Past active participles with stress variation

---

**Word-form**

зámёрший  
 óbмёрший  
 óтмёрший  
 пómёрший  
 ўмёрший

---

There would appear to be a growing tendency for the **imperative** of certain verbs to have stem-stress, rather than their traditional desinence-stress, due to apocopy of the final vowel; the truncated, stem-stressed variant is generally considered to be colloquial:

---

**Table 3.48** Past active participles with stress variation

---

Lexeme	Imperative forms
кроить	крóй, крой
слоить	слóй, слой
дойть	дóй, дой
пойть	пóй, пой

---

Variation is also found in the **infinitive**; some examples are *пристру́нить*, *принудíть*, *пригубíть*, *ржавéть*, *индевéть*, and some verbs in *-йровáть*. This variation is often accompanied by variation in other parts of the paradigm, eg the imperative, the pres/fut 2Sg+ (see Gorbachevich 1974, 1978:92-99). Variation in the infinitive is not investigated in this study.

d) The negative particles не/ни + past/pppS

For some category 2 verbs, sources record that stress may be retracted onto the negative particle не or ни immediately preceding the past m, nt, pl or pppS m, nt, pl, eg не́ был, не́ дан. A contrast of SFs is set up between negative particle + past/pppS m, nt, and pl phrases and negative particle + past/pppS f phrases. Thus, for example, не́ был, with its SF [ʲɪ̌ɐ̌bɪl] contrasts with не́ была́, with SF [ʲɪ̌ɐ̌bɪlʲ].

The verbs in question, with a full list of forms which are affected, are as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.49** Stress retraction in не/ни + past/pppS phrases  
 -----

Infinitive	SF1 (retraction)	SF2 (non-retraction)
бы́ть	не́ был, не́ было, не́ были ни́ был, ни́ было, ни́ были	не́ была́ ни́ была́
да́ть	не́ дал, не́ дало, не́ дали не́ дан, не́ дано, не́ даны	не́ далá не́ данá
жи́ть	не́ жил, не́ жило, не́ жили	не́ жилá
пи́ть	не́ пил, не́ пило, не́ пили	не́ пилá
взя́ть	не́ взял, не́ взяло, не́ взяли	не́ взялá

-----

Retraction with the verb **взять** is considered archaic, and the forms of this verb listed above, preceded by the particle не, were not investigated in this study. The other forms listed above as showing possible retraction were tested in the survey, to determine whether this does in fact occur.

## e) Adjectives

### System of stress

Stress is used distinctively in the four forms of the adjS in very much the same way as in the past and the pppS of verbs, which likewise have four forms each. In order to capture this similarity of patterning, the adjS is considered first separately from the adjL, which itself shows no stress mobility in its forms; again, the similarity with the pppL, which shows no stress mobility, is noticeable. Stress codes are assigned to the adjS in the same way as with the pppS, with the stress of the adjL discussed afterwards in terms of its relation to the stress of the adjS forms. The stress of the synthetic comparative form is easily derived from the adjS, and this is also treated below.

Three basic patterns of stress are found in the adjS. Examples of each pattern are given below:

#### 1.1: fixed stem-stress:

интерéсен  
интерéсна  
интерéсно  
интерéсны

1.2m: fixed desinence-stress; the zero-desinence adjS m has a different SF, and is assigned theoretical desinence-stress, indicated by the letter 'm':

умён	умнá
	умнó
	умны́

2: desinence-stress in the adjS f, contrasting stem-stress in the adjS m, nt and pl; the SF of the adjS f contrasts that of the other forms:

мóщен	мошнá
мóчно	
мóчны	

The following table summarises which morpheme is stressed in the different word-forms, for each of the three patterns. Theoretical stress is referred to for the adjS m in pattern 1.2m:

-----  
**Table 3.50** Morphemic stress of the different adjS classes  
 -----

Class	Example	Stem	Desinence
1.1	интерéсен	all	-
1.2m	умѐн	-	all
2	мóщен	adjS m nt pl	adjS f

-----

The following table summarises information as to which forms have SF contrasts:

-----  
**Table 3.51** SF contrasts in the different adjS classes  
 -----

Class	Example	SF1	SF2
1.1	интерéсен	-	-
1.2m	умѐн	adjS f nt pl	adjS m
2	мóщен	adjS m nt pl	adjS f

-----

The pattern of mobile stress in the adjS can be seen, in its simplest terms, as a distinguishing of the adjS f from the other forms of the adjS. Where there is a zero-desinence, the adjS m may also be distinguished by stress; stress falls stem-finally (eg умѐн) except for with the following nine adjectives (see Ilola & Mustajoki 1989:131, based on Zal.): во́лен - волна́, ра́вен - равна́, све́тел - светла́, те́мен - темна́, те́пел - тепла́, че́рен - черна́, до́лжен - должна́, бо́лен - больна́, ле́гкок - легка́.

The **synthetic comparative** in -ее or -ей is stressed like the adjS f, eg темна́ - темне́е; there are nine or so exceptions, where the adjS f is stem-stressed: дельне́е, здорове́е, лилове́е, розове́е, росле́е, сносне́е, срочне́е, хищне́е, древне́е. Around forty adjectives (see Ilola & Mustajoki 1989:115) have special comparative forms ending in -же, -ше, -ще or -че, eg ча́ще, ре́же. These comparatives are stressed on the syllable before this

ending; the ending is thus best seen as derivational, with its own pattern of stress (see Zalizniak 1985:89), rather than conforming to a pattern of stress associated with the inflectional system.

Stress is always fixed in the **adjL**, on the stem if the **adjL m NSg** ends in -ый/-ий, and on the desinence if the **adjL m NSg** ends in -ой. The inflected word-forms belonging to the **adjL** never show mobile stress.

Since there is no contrast of SFs, stress not being used distinctively, both types of **adjL** are given the code 1. Those with stem-stress, eg интересный, умный, мощный, are given the code 1.1, and those with fixed desinence-stress, eg смешной, босой, the code 1.2. All three patterns of stress are found for the **adjS** where the related **adjL** is stem-stressed. The following patterns are found for the **adjS** where the related **adjL** is desinence-stressed:

смешной

**adjS:** pattern 1.2m

смешна́  
смешно́  
смешны́

смешо́н

босой

**adjS:** pattern 2

бос  
босо  
босы

боса́

For the sake of compactness, it is often desirable to relate the stress of the **adjL** to that of the **adjS**. The **adjS** is the primary object of interest here, since it may use stress contrastively between its different word-forms; its code is therefore given first, and the code for the **adjL** given afterwards in brackets, eg интересный 1.1 (1.1), where the second, bracketed code number refers to the **adjL**, and the first to the **adjS**.

The patterns found when taking the stress of the **adjS** and the **adjL** together are given in the following table. Classes are not numbered on the basis of a comparison of the

adjS and adjL forms, since the latter never use stress contrastively; in the verbal system, by contrast, the past may use stress contrastively, and so separate classes are assigned to verbs that make use of such a contrast:

-----  
**Table 3.52** Stress patterns of adjS and adjL taken together  
 -----

Code	Example
1.1 (1.1)	интерéсный
1.2m (1.1)	úмный
1.2m (1.2)	смешнóй
2 (1.1)	мóщный
2 (1.2)	босóй

-----

Of the six patterns which could theoretically arise when the adjS and the adjL are taken together, only five are found; 1.1 (1.2) is the only combination which does not occur. Pattern 1.2m (1.2) is rather rare, since many adjL in -óй lack adjS forms altogether. Halle (1973) gives only the following 1.2m (1.2) adjectives: злóй, роднóй, чуднóй 'strange', блажнóй 'capricious', смешнóй, шальнóй 'mad', хмельнóй, больнóй; of these, блажнóй, шальнóй and роднóй lack adjS m and nt forms, and больнóй has the unexpected adjS m бóлен (Halle 1973:323).

The following generalisations about the morphemic stress of the different word-forms can be drawn; the second and third generalisation overlap:

(a) if the adjL is stem-stressed (1.1), the related adjS may follow any of the three patterns: fixed stem-stress, fixed desinence-stress, or mobile stress;

*a few examples at typ a 4* (b) if the adjL is desinence-stressed (1.2), the related adjS will also display desinence-stress, ~~either~~ in all its forms, ~~or~~ just in the adjS f;

(c) if the adjL is desinence-stressed, the adjS f will also be desinence-stressed.

The patterns which use stress contrastively, if the concept of theoretical stress is accepted, are as follows:

-----  
**Table 3.53** Forms contrasted, adjS and adjL together  
 -----

Code	Example	Contrasted
1.2m (1.1)	У́МНЫЙ	adjL
2 (1.1)	МО́ЩНЫЙ	adjS f
2 (1.2)	БОСО́Й	adjL, adjS f

-----

In this light, 2 (1.2) could be seen as the combination, in stress terms, of patterns 1.2m (1.1) and 2 (1.1). In patterns 1.2m (1.1) and 1.2m (1.2), the adjS m has a zero-desinence, and is also distinguished, either having the same SF as the adjL, eg ма́лый - ма́л (if these two are taken together), or a third SF3 (stressed stem-finally), eg сме́шной - сме́шон - сме́шна́. Seven dissyllabic-stemmed pattern 2 (1.1) adjectives have a different SF in the adjS m, nt and pl from that of the adjL. These are as follows (from Ilola & Mustajoki 1989:131, based on Zal.):

-----  
**Table 3.54** Pattern 2 (1.1) adjectives with contrasting adjL stress  
 -----

SF1	SF2	SF3
весё́лый	весе́л	весела́
голо́дный	голо́ден	голо́дна́
зеле́ный	зеле́н	зелена́
соле́ный	со́лон	солонá
холо́дный	холо́ден	холо́дна́
дешё́вый	деше́в	дешева́
коро́ткий	коро́ток	коро́тка́

-----

The adjective счастли́вый 1.1 (1.1) has different SFs in the adjL and adjS forms: счастли́вый cf сча́слив.

To summarise, there are three basic patterns of mobility if the adjS and adjL are taken together, and the concept of



theoretical stress is followed: distinctive contrasts occur involving either the adjS f, or the adjL, or both. No other types of mobility are found; there is no mobility between the different inflected forms of the adjL.

### Variation

Variation is particularly common in the adjS; Zal. contains 195 adjectives with stress variants for one word-form or another (cf Ilola & Mustajoki 1985:118), and this is clearly an area of considerable instability in Russian. Variation occurs in the forms of the adjS f, nt, pl and, to a certain extent, the adjS m; these forms are discussed below.

Variation is extremely rare in non-derived adjL forms (see Gorbachevich 1978:109, footnote 88). Variation in derived adjL forms, eg заво́дский - заводско́й, is not discussed in this study; the differentiation by stress of certain adjectivalised pppL forms from their motivating pppL forms is discussed in section 3)c)iv).

Variation is to a large extent restricted to adjectives which may display pattern 2 (the handful of adjectives belonging to other classes for which variation is recorded are also examined below). The first group of these waver between pattern 2 and 1.1, eg а́лый :

а́л		
а́ла	or	ала́
а́лю		
а́лы		

The synthetic comparative, as stated above, is with very few exceptions stressed like the adjS f. If stem- and desinence-stressed adjS f variants exist, the synthetic comparative is always desinence-stressed.

Some class 2 adjectives are recorded as showing variation in the adjS pl, eg бо́йкий, круто́й :

бо́ек		бойка́
бойко́		
бойки́	or	бойки́

Other class 2 adjectives are recorded as showing variation in the adjS nt and the adjS pl, eg бе́лый

бе́л		бела́
бе́ло	or	бело́
бе́лы	or	белы́

Accepting that the adjS m, with its zero-desinence, does not show mobility, the following categories of stress contrast and types of variation are found for the adjS; the form(s) that are subject to variation are listed in brackets:

-----  
**Table 3.55** Variation in contrasts of stress in adjS  
 -----

Example	Contrasted
а́лый	(adjS f)
мо́щный	adjS f
бо́йкий	adjS f (pl)
бе́лый	adjS f (pl, nt)

-----

It is clear that if stress is, or may be, used contrastively in one form then this form will be the adjS f, which will be distinguished by desinence-stress. If two forms may be distinguished by desinence-stress, these will be the adjS f (compulsorily) and the adjS pl (optionally). If three forms may be distinguished by desinence-stress, these will be the adjS f (compulsorily), the adjS pl and the adjS nt (both optionally).

The following hierarchy may be constructed:

```

adjS f
adjS pl
adjS nt

```

*general rule f*  
 If a form is distinguished by desinence-stress, all the forms above it in the hierarchy will also be distinguished by the same stress. The adjS pl will not be distinguished unless

the adjS f is distinguished; the adjS nt will not be distinguished unless the adjS f and the adjS pl are also distinguished.

In terms of SF contrasts in the adjS, the hierarchy can either be seen as above, whereby the contrasting SF has desinence-stress, or equally as below, where the contrasting SF has stem-stress:

adjS m  
adjS nt  
adjS pl

#### i) Feminine short form

The following list contains the commonest class 2 adjectives (from Red.) which show no variation in any of their forms (according to Red. and Zal.):

-----  
**Table 3.56** Common class 2 adjectives showing no variation  
-----

Лексема	Class
бо́рзый	2 (1.1)
ве́тхий	2 (1.1)
га́дкий	2 (1.1)
ги́бкий	2 (1.1)
гла́дкий	2 (1.1)
гро́мкий	2 (1.1)
гу́лкий	2 (1.1)
де́рзкий	2 (1.1)
дешё́вый	2 (1.1)
ди́кий	2 (1.1)
до́лгий	2 (1.1)
дря́хлый	2 (1.1)
ду́шный	2 (1.1)
дю́жий	2 (1.1)
жа́лкий	2 (1.1)
жи́дкий	2 (1.1)
кра́ткий	2 (1.1)
кро́ткий	2 (1.1)
ла́дный	2 (1.1)
ло́бкий	2 (1.1)
лы́сый	2 (1.1)
лю́тый	2 (1.1)
ме́рзкий	2 (1.1)
ме́ткий	2 (1.1)
на́глый	2 (1.1)
ни́щий	2 (1.1)

по́длый	2 (1.1)
по́стный	2 (1.1)
по́шлый	2 (1.1)
пра́вый	2 (1.1)
пры́ткий	2 (1.1)
пы́шный	2 (1.1)
ро́бкий	2 (1.1)
ры́жий	2 (1.1)
рыхлый	2 (1.1)
сдо́бный	2 (1.1)
се́рый	2 (1.1)
си́зый	2 (1.1)
си́ний	2 (1.1)
скла́дный	2 (1.1)
ско́рый	2 (1.1)
сла́вный	2 (1.1)
смúтный	2 (1.1)
спóрый	2 (1.1)
стра́нный	2 (1.1)
сы́тный	2 (1.1)
сы́тый	2 (1.1)
то́мный	2 (1.1)
то́щий	2 (1.1)
тя́жкий	2 (1.1)
хру́пкий	2 (1.1)
це́лый	2 (1.1)
це́льный	2 (1.1)
ча́стый	2 (1.1)
шиб́кий	2 (1.1)
ю́ный	2 (1.1)
ю́ркий	2 (1.1)
благóй	2 (1.2)
босóй	2 (1.2)
гнилóй	2 (1.2)
дорогóй	2 (1.2)
дря́ннóй	<del>2 (1.2)</del>
живóй	2 (1.2)
кривóй	2 (1.2)
лихóй	<del>2 (1.2)</del>
младóй	2 (1.2)
молóдóй	2 (1.2)
нагóй	2 (1.2)
немóй	2 (1.2)
разбитóй	2 (1.2)
рябóй	2 (1.2)
святóй	2 (1.2)
седóй	2 (1.2)
слепóй	2 (1.2)
сырóй	2 (1.2)
тугóй	2 (1.2)
холостóй	2 (1.2)
хромóй	2 (1.2)

-----

The lists below contain adjectives which in at least one source, and in at least certain of their meanings, show variation in one or more of their forms. In other meanings, different sources, or certain forms, they may belong to classes other than those stated below, or indeed show no variation. The lists are thus comprehensive in their inclusion of all forms which may show variation. The lists were compiled initially on the basis of information contained in Zal. and Red., which was then compared with other sources. All forms showing variation were tested in the survey.

The eighty or so adjectives in the first list below are those assigned by some sources to class 2, and showing variation in the adjS f. They do not show variation in other adjS forms. If the adjS f is desinence-stressed they belong in class 2; if it is stem-stressed they fall into class 1.1.

There is no semantic differentiation for the majority of cases; a few, however, were tested in different meanings, or with a regular and then with an 'excessive' meaning, ie велика 'big' versus 'too big'.

Zalizniak (1985:25-27) believes that rare or unusual adjS forms, as well as those that have archaic, bookish or elevated overtones, will have fixed stem-stress in all forms. Common, fully assimilated words, by contrast, will have desinential stress in the adjS f; he gives the examples честнá, крепкá, чистá. The existence of variants in the adjS f indicates, he believes, a transitional stage, as a word-form becomes more or less assimilated. The possible role of frequency or familiarity, however, was not examined in this study.

These, then, were the adjectives whose adjS f were examined in the survey; the meanings of all lexemes examined in the survey are given in Chapter 5:

---

**Table 3.57** Adjectives showing variation in adjS f
 

---

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Class</b>
áлый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
брóский	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
буйный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
бу́рный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
бу́рый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ва́ркий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ва́лкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
вели́кий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ве́рткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
взрóслый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
вла́стный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
вя́зкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
гне́вный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
го́нкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
дро́бный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
дря́блый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
е́дкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
жестóкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
зно́бкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
зо́ркий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
зы́бкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
зя́бкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ка́ткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
кве́лий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
кле́йкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ко́вкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ко́лкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ку́чный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ле́вый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ло́мкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
лю́дный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ма́зкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ма́ркий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
мо́дный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
мы́лкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
но́ский	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
па́ркий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
пла́вкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
пла́вный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
пло́ский	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
при́нятый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
припо́днятый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
разви́тый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
са́дкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
си́вый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
си́пый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
си́рый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
скли́зкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ско́льзкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
сли́зкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
сма́чный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
сму́рый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)

со́вкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ста́тный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
сто́йкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
схо́дный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
сы́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
те́рпкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
то́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
тру́хлый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
тря́ский	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хва́ткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хво́рый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хи́лый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хле́сткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хли́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хлю́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хля́бкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хму́рый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хо́дкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хри́плый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хру́сткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
хря́ский	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ца́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
це́нный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
це́пкий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
че́ткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
чи́нный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ша́ткий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
щу́плый	2 or 1.1 (1.1)

-----

The following adjectives are assigned by some sources to class 2, and have variable stress in the adjS f and adjS pl; different stress variants are thought to occur with different meanings (see chapter 5):

-----

**Table 3.58** Adjectives showing variation in adjS f and pl

-----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Class</b>
вели́кий	2 or 1.1 (1.1)
ви́дный	2 or 1.1 (1.1)

-----

## ii) Neuter short form

A comparison of various sources reveals around forty-five adjectives for which variation in the adjS nt is recorded, the majority of which are class 2 adjectives. The choice of one stress variant over another is thought to be linked to syntactic factors; this is examined below. When used adjectivally, factors such as the stress of the corresponding adjL, as well as stylistic (literary versus non-literary) and semantic factors, are important.

Four distinct syntactic uses can be identified for the adjS nt:

- (a) adjectival use;
- (b) normal adverbial use;
- (c) predicative use (also called the category of state);
- (d) use in set phrases.

Zalizniak (1985:26-7) states that only forms found in the adjectival use should be placed in a paradigm with the other adjS forms, since only these forms are comparable.

Zalizniak (1985:26) and Garde (1980:218-9) believe that, in their **adjectival** use, in the literary language, the adjS nt is most often stem-stressed. The use of a desinence-stressed variant may be linked to one or more of the factors below. It should be noted that the adjS in its adjectival use is often replaced by adjL, especially in the spoken language.

Where the adjL is desinence-stressed, Zalizniak (1985:26-27) believes that desinence-stress may also be found in the adjS nt, eg больно́, чудно́; where desinence-stress is traditional, this may also be retained, beside stem-stressed variants, eg мертвó, острó, умно́, хитро́.

Stylistic factors concern the degree of familiarity of the word, and whether certain variants are considered archaic, elevated, bookish, colloquial, and so on. Zalizniak (1985:25) and/or OS give stem-stress as literary, and mark desinence-stress as non-literary (colloquial, typical of popular speech, 'incorrect') for близко, важно, весело, жестоко,



нужно, сильно, хмельно; the situation is reversed for тепло and темно.

One semantic factor is that the adjS nt from certain adjectives, typically those of dimension (such as узко, длинно, мало), may be used with an 'excessive' meaning, that is, with the meaning 'too x', where x is the meaning of the adjective. Where both desinence- and stem-stressed variants exist, it is possible that stress is used to distinguish the regular meaning (stem-stressed) from the 'excessive' meaning (desinence-stressed) of the adjS nt; Zalizniak (1985:26) believes that desinence-stress is typical of this 'excessive' meaning, and this was therefore tested in the survey.

Zalizniak (1985:26) further states that the adjS nt forms of adjectives from the semantic field of colours and the like may have desinence-stress, eg бело, черно, красно, желто, пестро, светло, темно.

Opinions differ on the stress occurring in the **adverbial** use of the adjS nt. Zalizniak (1985:26) considers the stem-stressed variant to be normal, eg вольно, больно, полно, мало, слабо. Garde (1980:218-9), by contrast, expects the desinence-stressed form to be that most often used as an adverb.

When used as **predicatives**, Garde (1980:218-9) again believes that desinence-stress will be most common. Zalizniak (1985:26) states that there is no norm, but that a large group do indeed have desinence-stress, with little variation, eg тепло. Colour terms such as черно, he believes, fall into this category when used as predicatives, eg на дворе черно; this stress is also found in 'reinforced' forms such as черным-черно.

No regularities apply to the stress of the adjS nt in **set-phrases**. Forms in such usages may be preserved, historical relics, contrasting with modern forms found outside these contexts. In other instances, their stress be affected by rhyme or the rhythmic elements of the phrase.

The following list contains the class 2 adjectives which the dictionary sources consulted record as having adjS nt stress variants (some of which may be restricted to particular syntactic uses); all these adjectives also show variation in the adjS pl, as discussed above, and the adjS pl

forms were therefore also tested in the survey. No variation is recorded for the adjS f, which is desinence-stressed as expected. For some lexemes, the adjS m also shows variation, and it, too, was tested in the survey:

-----  
**Table 3.59** Adjectives showing variation in adjS nt and pl  
 -----

Лексема	Class
бе́дный	2 (1.1)
бе́лый	2 (1.1)
бле́дный	2 (1.1)
бли́зкий	2 (1.1)
бо́дрый	2 (1.1)
ва́жный	2 (1.1)
весёлый	2 (1.1)
во́льный	2 (1.1)
во́стрый	2 (1.1)
высо́кий	2 (1.1)
глубо́кий	2 (1.1)
голо́дный	2 (1.1)
го́лый	2 (1.1)
гре́шный	2 (1.1)
далёкий	2 (1.1)
длинный	2 (1.1)
до́брый	2 (1.1)
же́лтый	2 (1.1)
жесто́кий	2 (1.1)
корóткий	2 (1.1)
красный	2 (1.1)
ме́ртвый	2 (1.1)
мо́крый	2 (1.1)
ну́жный	2 (1.1)
о́бщий	2 (1.1)
о́стрый	2 (1.1)
пе́стрый	2 (1.1)
по́льный	2 (1.1)
све́тлый	2 (1.1)
си́льный	2 (1.1)
сла́бый	2 (1.1)
ста́рый	2 (1.1)
те́мный	2 (1.1)
те́плый	2 (1.1)
те́сный	2 (1.1)
у́зкий	2 (1.1)
у́мный	2 (1.1)
хи́трый	2 (1.1)
холо́дный	2 (1.1)
че́рный	2 (1.1)
широ́кий	2 (1.1)
хмельно́й, хме́льный	2 (1.1) or (1.2)
дрянно́й	2 (1.2)

-----

The following class 1.2 adjectives are recorded as showing variation in the adjS nt only:

-----  
**Table 3.60** Adjectives showing variation in adjS nt only  
 -----

Lexeme	Class
до́лжный	1.2 (1.1)
ма́лый	1.2 (1.1)
бо́льный	1.2 (1.2)
зе́мной	1.2 (1.2)

-----

### iii) Plural short form

Approximately 150 adjectives show variation in the adjS pl. These are mostly class 2 adjectives, a considerable number of which (see above) also display variation in the adjS nt.

No semantic distinction is generally found for stress variants in the adjS pl. For a few adjectives, stress may be used to distinguish regular meanings from 'excessive' meanings; this was examined in the survey.

Zalizniak (1985:25) considers stem-stress in the adjS pl to be the earlier, that is, original, pattern; at the present time desinence-stress is, he considers, making gains, primarily in the colloquial language, but also in the literary standard. Zalizniak further believes (1985:27) that patterns of fixed desinence-stress or the coexistence of stem- and desinence-stressed adjS pl variants expresses familiarity.

OS does not indicate any stylistic or semantic differentiation between the two (exceptionally three, eg ко́ротки́) adjS pl variants, for the majority of words admitting of such variants; both are generally marked as equally correct. If one is recommended, it will usually be the stem-stressed variant. In only a few words is the stem-

stressed variant marked obsolescent and the desinence-stressed variant preferred.

The list below contains class 2 adjectives which show variation in the adjS pl alone; note that tables 3.58 and 3.59 (see above) give adjectives showing variation in other word-forms as well as the adjS pl. No variation is recorded for the desinence-stressed adjS f or the stem-stressed adjS nt for the adjectives below:

-----  
**Table 3.61** Class 2 adjectives showing variation in adjS pl only  
 -----

<b>Lexeme</b>	<b>Class</b>
бо́йкий	2 (1.1)
бы́стрый	2 (1.1)
ве́рный	2 (1.1)
ви́дный	2 (1.1)
вку́сный	2 (1.1)
вла́жный	2 (1.1)
вре́дный	2 (1.1)
глу́пый	2 (1.1)
гну́сный	2 (1.1)
го́дный	2 (1.1)
го́рдый	2 (1.1)
го́рький	2 (1.1)
гро́зный	2 (1.1)
гру́бый	2 (1.1)
гру́зный	2 (1.1)
гру́стный	2 (1.1)
гря́зный	2 (1.1)
дру́жный	2 (1.1)
жа́дный	2 (1.1)
жё́сткий	2 (1.1)
жи́рный	2 (1.1)
звучный	2 (1.1)
зеле́ный	2 (1.1)
зна́тный	2 (1.1)
кислый	2 (1.1)
кре́пкий	2 (1.1)
кру́глый	2 (1.1)
кру́пный	2 (1.1)
ло́вкий	2 (1.1)
ме́лкий	2 (1.1)
ми́лый	2 (1.1)
мра́чный	2 (1.1)
му́дрый	2 (1.1)
му́тный	2 (1.1)
мя́гкий	2 (1.1)
не́жный	2 (1.1)
ни́зкий	2 (1.1)
но́вый	2 (1.1)
ну́дный	2 (1.1)

плотный	2 (1.1)
пресный	2 (1.1)
прочный	2 (1.1)
пьяный	2 (1.1)
редкий	2 (1.1)
резвый	2 (1.1)
резкий	2 (1.1)
ровный	2 (1.1)
скверный	2 (1.1)
склонный	2 (1.1)
скромный	2 (1.1)
скудный	2 (1.1)
скучный	2 (1.1)
сложный	2 (1.1)
смелый	2 (1.1)
смирный	2 (1.1)
смуглый	2 (1.1)
солёный	2 (1.1)
сочный	2 (1.1)
спелый	2 (1.1)
страшный	2 (1.1)
строгий	2 (1.1)
стройный	2 (1.1)
сумный	2 (1.1)
твёрдый	2 (1.1)
тихий	2 (1.1)
толстый	2 (1.1)
тонкий	2 (1.1)
точный	2 (1.1)
трезвый	2 (1.1)
трудный	2 (1.1)
тусклый	2 (1.1)
тучный	2 (1.1)
храбрый	2 (1.1)
чёрствый	2 (1.1)
честный	2 (1.1)
чистый	2 (1.1)
чуждый	2 (1.1)
шумный	2 (1.1)
шустрый	2 (1.1)
щедрый	2 (1.1)
яркий	2 (1.1)
ясный	2 (1.1)
удалой, удалый	2 (1.1) or (1.2)
глухой	2 (1.2)
густой	2 (1.2)
дурной	2 (1.2)
косой	2 (1.2)
крутой	2 (1.2)
лихой	2 (1.2)
простой	2 (1.2)
плохой	2 (1.2)
прямой	2 (1.2)
пустой	2 (1.2)
скупой	2 (1.2)
сухой	2 (1.2)

тупо́й	2 (1.2)
худо́й	2 (1.2)

-----

The following adjectives from class 1.2 are also recorded as showing variation in the adjS pl only:

-----

**Table 3.62** Class 1.2 adjectives showing variation in adjS pl only

-----

Лексема	Class
лёгкий	1.2 (1.1)
све́жий	1.2 (1.1)

-----

The adjectives below, which belong to other classes, show variation or stress contrasts in all four adjS forms, or all forms except the adjS m:

- чу́дный 1.1 (1.1) 'marvellous' contrasts by means of stress with чудно́й 1.2 (1.2) 'strange';
- счастли́вый 1.1 (1.1) shows variation between stem-initial stress, ie сча́слив-, and stem-final stress, ie счастли́в-;
- мудре́ный 1.2 (1.1).

This completes our categorisation of stress patterns occurring in Russian words and identification of areas of variation.

## Chapter 4

### Dictionary and Summarised Survey Data

#### Methodology of the survey

The survey looks at variation in mobile stress and certain other features of stress movement or differentiation of forms by stress in Contemporary Standard Russian.

Data for inclusion in the survey <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ established primarily on the basis of the information contained in Red., Zal., and OS, with further reference to AG and other sources where appropriate (see discussion of variation at the end of each section of Chapter 3). If there was disagreement about the stress of a word-form or group of word-forms in two or more of the main reference sources, or if variants were indicated in any of these sources (with or without normative markings), this was taken as evidence of variation.

Evidence from Nessel (1994) would suggest that, for nouns at least, this approach underestimates the true level of variation in modern Russian. The limitations of space imposed by the broad scope of the present study, however, necessitated a reliance on reference works as a source of evidence of variation; we have not looked for variation where none has been previously recorded. Nevertheless, the experience of the survey has shown that there is much less unanimity in matters of stress than many of the often strongly normative reference works consulted imply. The evidence for this can be seen from the tables below.

Having thus established which word-forms were to be included in the survey, each one was placed in a short sentence, sufficient to establish the grammatical identity of the word-form. If, for example, two stress variants exist for the DP1 word-form of a noun lexeme, the form was put in a sentence where its occurrence was both possible and also natural. If a word-form is thought to differ in its stress when used gerundially as opposed to adverbially, two appropriate sentences were constructed, where the use of one form or the other would be expected. Sentences are for the most part original, but on occasion recourse has been had to

examples from the 17-volume academy dictionary (1950-65); this is especially the case with less common word-forms, in particular some adjS and more unusual pppS forms.

In this way a corpus of 1,457 short sentences was drawn up. Their grammatical correctness and, as far as possible, their naturalness was confirmed by several native speakers of Contemporary Standard Russian. A copy of the survey as it appeared at this stage is included in Appendix A. Before field-work was carried out, however, all reference to the structure of the survey (headings and sub-headings) was removed, and the sentences were rearranged in random order with the aim of eliciting as natural a reading as possible from the informants.

Twenty-one speakers of Contemporary Standard Russian were selected to be recorded reading the sentences. Two criteria for the selection of informants were applied: first, that they should be native speakers of standard Russian; second, that they should represent an age-range of between approximately 20 and 65 years old. The first criterion was considered to be fulfilled if the informant was:

- i) a native speaker of Russian;
- ii) a Muscovite, ie born in Moscow and lived there all his/her life;
- iii) educated to at least tertiary level.

Two informants (numbers 10 and 18) were not born in Moscow; the first of these received her primary school education in St Petersburg, and has lived for the last thirty years in Moscow; the second moved to Moscow aged two. In addition to the above criteria, it was considered desirable for the informant to have been brought up by native Russian-speaking parents, although non-fulfilment of this requirement was not considered sufficient grounds for disqualification. Full biographical details of the informants are included in Appendix B.

Informants were asked to read the sentences aloud in a natural voice and at a natural tempo, and were recorded as they did so. They were asked simply to read the sentences one



after another, and not to comment on their content or construction, although they were given an opportunity to do so afterwards; their comments are reflected in the discussion in Chapter 5. If they considered they had 'misread' a sentence, they were asked to repeat the sentence immediately. If it was noticed that a mistake had been made of which they were unaware, they were requested to repeat the individual sentence or sentences at the end of the recording. The informants were not told what was being investigated, although the majority soon became aware that the survey concerned stress as a result of their own hesitation over pronouncing word-forms.

Twenty-one recordings, generally of just under an hour each, were made at various locations in Moscow between 27 August and 23 September 1994. The recordings were then analysed (by ear) and the informants' stress of the tested words taken down onto paper. This information was then fed into spreadsheets on computer, re-arranged horizontally to the original order of the survey sentences, and sorted vertically by the age of the informant, with the youngest informant's data furthest left, the oldest's furthest right. The full results of the survey are included in Appendix C.

The following methodology was followed in analysing the recordings and drawing up the spreadsheets of the informants' data:

- i) the variant given by the informant is marked with the symbol  $\checkmark$ ;
- ii) if the informant gives both variants as equally valid, commenting that either one or the other can be used, both are marked with the symbol  $\checkmark+$ ;
- iii) if the informant reads the tested word-form clearly, giving it one stress, and then rereads, changing the stress, the final version is marked with the symbol  $\checkmark$ , and the previously suggested version(s) with the symbol ?; if the informant reads the tested word-form several times, changing the stress each time,

the same method is followed, with all previously suggested variants marked ?, and the final version marked √;

iv) if the informant is unable to read the tested word-form, because he/she does not know the word, does not know the word-form's stress, or does not understand the sentence, then the relevant cells are left blank;

v) if the informant misreads the tested word-form, or the sentence, such that the stress of the tested word-form would be affected, and does not correct the mistake either immediately or at the end of the recording, the relevant cells are left blank;

vi) the symbol ✕, representing a misread or omitted answer, may appear below a set of variants; the total number of omissions or misreadings is given in the column marked 'No.√';

vii) comments made by the informants on the sentences or the tested words are noted in the discussion of the data in Chapter 5.

Each √ is counted as one point, each √+ as 0.5 points, and the total number of points for each variant appears in the column marked 'No. √'; the symbol ? is ignored for these calculations. The column marked '% total' gives the percentage of the total number of answers (excluding those misread and not corrected) for each variant, rounded to whole figures. The occurrence of each variant (ie total number of √) for informants under 35 years of age ('-35'), and over 35 years of age ('35+') is also given; note that there are eleven informants under 35 and ten informants over 35.

The tables which follow in this chapter offer a summary of the survey results, side by side with the information contained in several standard reference works. Survey data have been summarised in the following way:

- i) data for individual informants has been omitted;
- ii) columns are retained showing total occurrences of each variant ('No.√', out of 21), occurrences for speakers under 35 ('-35', out of a maximum of 11), occurrences for speakers over 35 ('35+', out of a maximum of 10), and the percentage of the total number of answers given for each variant ('% total', 100% representing the total number of answers given);
- iii) a column entitled 'Comments' gives further information about the tested word-form; this may be the grammatical form it represents, the context in which it is found, a brief translation, or such like. Full details are given in the discussion section (Chapter 5);
- iv) additional notes, indicated by bracketed numbers in the tables, appear at the bottom of each table.

In addition, columns giving a summary of the information found in the dictionaries and other lexicographical sources consulted are added to the right of the survey data, with the most recent source to the left, the oldest to the right. The symbol √ indicates that the variant in question is given in the source. Markings such as **dop**, **dop ustar**, **neprav**, **ne rek**, and the like, indicate that variants were given, but marked with one of these comments; a full key to the abbreviations used is located at the beginning of this study. The lexicographical sources used are discussed in Chapter 2; some further details are given below.

An empty cell in the dictionary data columns means that a particular variant is not attested in the source. This is generally taken to mean that the compilers of the source in question do not recognise the existence of such a variant; it may also occasionally be interpreted as meaning that the stress of the word-form in question is 'regular'. It should be noted, however, that, as a rule, *the tables only contain information on a stress variant if it is explicitly listed in the source*. If conclusions have been drawn about implied

'regular' stress, where variants are not explicitly listed in the source, this is drawn attention to in the notes at the bottom of the table.

It will be noticed that the dictionary data often provides more contexts than were tested in the survey, or contexts which do not fully correspond to those in the survey. There are two reasons for this: first, restrictions of size meant that the survey was selective in its choice of different contexts; second, the dictionary data are of a varied nature, often with different contexts and contrasts being noted by different dictionaries, with much of the information conflicting or incomplete. For this reason, the number of columns has been increased, to reflect as far as possible the full range of dictionary data, with the survey data being matched as far as possible to these data. Note, however, that in table b)ii) (preposition + numeral phrases), where no further information as regards the environment in which stress is retracted is given in <sup>o</sup>dictionary, the dictionary data is listed as P+Num%. Detailed discussion of particular problems is found in the discussion in Chapter 5.

Dictionary data are not listed for forms where no variation is recorded in the sources consulted; in other words, columns only appear for word-forms which display variants of stress, including variants used to form semantic distinctions and forms appearing in set-phrases and proverbs. The discussion in Chapter 5, however, refers to other parts of the paradigm where appropriate, simply stating that no variation for these forms is recorded in the sources consulted.

The tables are ordered in the following way:

-----  
**Table 4.1** Contents of tables, with corresponding sentence numbers  
 -----

<b>Table</b>	<b>Contents</b>	<b>Sentence no. in survey (see Appendix A)</b>
4)a)	<b>nouns</b>	246-397
b)	<b>prepositions</b>	
i)	+ noun phrases	1-177
ii)	+ numeral phrases	178-245
c)	<b>verbs</b>	
i)	past, pppS	848-1296
ii)	reflexive verbs: past	1297-1454
iii)	pppL versus adjL	814-847
iv)	present gerund	773-788
d)	<b>negative particles</b> ne/ni + past/pppS	789-813
e)	<b>adjectives</b>	
i)	adjS f	688-772
ii)	adjS nt, pl, m	398-687

-----

#### Notes on lexicographical sources

##### Red.

Red.'s sources are A&O (1960), the 17-volume academy dictionary (1950-65), Ushakov (1935-40), and Ozhegov (1960). He has some inconsistencies and some probable misreadings of his sources or typographical errors; these are taken account of in the tables below. If two variants are ticked, this is sometimes an indication that the different sources he consulted listed different variants; this he simply reproduces, without further comment.

##### Zal.

Variants are given in Zal. such that the variant listed second is either equally current or slightly less current than the first. In the tables below, both variants are simply ticked, as for A&O, etc. Explicit information (eg if a variant is marked as obsolete) is included in the table.

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	<b>4)a) Nouns</b>										
246	N/API 'bench'	ска́мьи ска́мь х	2 18 1	0 11	2 7	10% 90%		dop ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	dop ✓
247	PP1	ска́мьях ска́мьях	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%		dop ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
248	GPI 'judge'	судей судей судьям судьям	14 7 21	8 3 11	6 4 10	67% 33% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	ne ✓ ✓ ✓
249	DPI										
250	GPI 'diamonds (suit of cards)'	бу́бен бу́бен бу́бнах бу́бнах	13 8 21	9 2 11	4 6 10	62% 38% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	ne ✓ ne ✓	ne ✓ ne ✓
251	PP1										
252	PP1 'money'	де́ньгах де́ньгах	7 14	6 5	1 9	33% 67%	ustar ✓	dop ustar ✓	ustar ✓	ustar ✓	ustar ✓
253	GPI 'wood-sledge'	дро́вней дро́вней дро́вням дро́вням	20 1 21	10 1 11	10 0 10	95% 5% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	dop ✓ ✓	✓ dop dop
254	DPI										
255	NPI (gde ... ) 'tongs; ticks'	кле́щи кле́щи кле́щи	18.5 2.5	9.5 1.5	9 1	88% 12%					
	N/API 'tongs' (plurale tantum)						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		клящі клящі					✓	dop	✓	dop	✓
	NP1 'ticks'						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
256	GPI 'bran'	отрубей отрубей	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
257	PP1	отрубях отрубях	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
258	GPI 'harness; braces'	помочей помочей помочей х	13 1 5 2	7 1 2	6 0 3	68% 5% 26%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
259	GPI 'funeral'	похорон похорон похоронах похоронах					ne	ne rek	✓	ne	ne
260	PP1		21 2 19	11 1 10	10 1 9	100% 10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
261	GPI 'labour; delivery'	родов родов родах родах	19 2 20 1	11 0 11 0	8 2 9 1	90% 10% 95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
262	PP1						✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
263	PP1 'flea'	блѡх блѡх	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
264	PP1 'wave'	вѡлнах вѡлнах	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	N/API (-) (1)	тряды								✓	✓
	PPI (-) (1)	трядах								✓	
		трядах								✓	✓
265	N/API 'bed' (horticultural)	тряды	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓		
		тряды	3	1	2	14%					
266	PPI 'bed' (horticultural)	трядах	15	8	7	71%	✓	✓	✓		
		трядах	6	3	3	29%					
267	N/API 'bank/range' (eg clouds, hills)	тряды	14	9	5	67%	✓		✓		
		тряды	7	2	5	33%					
268	PPI 'bank/range' (eg clouds, hills)	трядах	11	6	5	52%		✓	✓		
		трядах	10	5	5	48%	✓				
269	N/API 'trough'	дѣжи	3	1	2	23%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		дѣжи	6	4	2	46%	✓				
		дѣжи	4	2	2	31%			✓		
		х	8								
270	GPI 'glands; tonsils'	жѣлез	3	2	1	15%		ne rek			ne
		жѣлѣз	1	1	0	5%					
		жѣлѣз	16	7	9	80%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
271	DPI	жѣлезам	10	7	3	53%		ne rek			ne rek
		жѣлѣзам	2	0	2	11%					
		жѣлѣзам	1	0	1	5%					
		жѣлѣзам	6	3	3	32%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	2								
272	N/API 'swelling from hernia'	кѣлы	17	9	8	94%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		кѣлы	1	0	1	6%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
273	PPI	х кйлах кйлах х	3 7 10 4	5 4	2 6	41% 59%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
274	GPI 'shock, stook (of corn)'	кóпéн кóпéн кóпéн кóпнaх кóпнáх	11 2 8 11 10	8 1 2 5 6	3 1 6 6 4	52% 10% 38% 52% 48%		✓	✓		
275	PPI						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
276	N/API 'large piece of felt' (2)	кóшмы кóшмы кóшем кóшм кóшмaх кóшмáх х					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
277	PPI		12 4 5	5 2	7 2	75% 25%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
278	N/API 'boundary-strip'	мéжи мéжй х мéж мéжéй мéжaх мéжáх	4 16 1	3 8	1 8	20% 80%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
279	PPI		1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
280	NSg 'shaft'	óбжa óбжá	4 3	1 1	3 2	57% 43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
281	ASg	x обжу обжу x обжей обжей x обжах обжах x	14 5 2 14 4 3 14 5 2 14		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		71% 29%  57% 43%  71% 29%	✓ ✓  ✓ ✓  ✓ ✓	✓ ✓  ✓ ✓  ✓ ✓	✓ ✓  ✓ ✓  ✓ ✓	
282	GPI						✓	✓	✓	✓	
283	PP1						✓	✓	✓	✓	
284	GPI 'communion bread'	просвир просвир просвирах просвирах просвирах x	21 20 1	11 11 1	10 9	100% 100%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓ (3) (3) ✓ dop	✓ dop ✓ dop
286	NSg 'sheet'	простынь простыня простыня простынь простынь простыней простынях простынях					neprav neprav ✓ ne rek ✓ ✓ ne rek ✓	neprav neprav ✓ ne rek ✓ ne rek ✓	neprav neprav ✓ ne rek ✓ ne rek ✓	neprav neprav ✓ ne rek ✓ ne rek ✓	
1455	GPI		21 1	11 0	10 1	100% 5%	✓ ne ✓	✓ ne rek ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ne ✓	✓ ne ✓
287	PP1		20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne ✓
288	DPI 'earring'	серьгам серьгам	7.5 13.5	5 6	2.5 7.5	36% 64%	✓ ✓	dop ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	NSg 'stack, rick'	скір́д					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скірда́					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
289	N/API	скірды́	9	6	3	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скірды́	12	5	7	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
290	DPI	скірдам	8	6	2	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скірда́м	13	5	8	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
291	PPI 'clamp, staple'	ско́бах	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
		скоба́х	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
292	ASg 'frying-pan'	ско́вороду́	9	4	5	43%	✓	dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		сковоро́ду́	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
293	GPI	ско́вород	2	1	1	10%	ne	ne rek	✓	✓	✓
		сковоро́д	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
294	DPI	ско́вородам	5	1	4	25%	ne	ne rek	✓	✓	✓
		сковоро́да́м	15	9	6	75%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
295	PPI 'beam'	сле́гах	19	10	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		слегáх	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
296	GPI 'sloboda'	сло́бод	1	1	0	5%	ne rek	ne rek	✓	✓	✓
		слобо́д	19	10	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
297	PPI	сло́бодах	3	1	2	14%		ne rek			
		слобо́да́х	2	0	2	10%					
		слободáх	16	10	6	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
298	PP1 'stanza, strophe'	стро́фах строфа́х	5 16	4 7	1 9	24% 76%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	ne ✓
	N/API 'fate'	судьбы́					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	GPI	судеб					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(voleiu ... ) 'as fate has decreed'	судеб					dop ustar	✓	ustar	ustar	ustar
	DPI	судеб					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		судьба́м					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(kakimi ... ?) 'fancy meeting you here!'	судьба́м судьба́ми					✓	✓	✓	ustar ✓	ustar ✓
299	PP1 'path'	тро́пах тропа́х	17.5 3.5	9 2	8.5 1.5	83% 17%	✓	✓ dop ustar	✓ ustar	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
300	N/API 'splinter, chip (of wood)'	ще́пы щепы́ х	19 1 1	11 0	8 1	95% 5%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓(4) ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
301	DPI	ще́пам щепа́м х	11 9 1	7 3	4 6	55% 45%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓(4)	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
	A/GSg 'thief'	во́ра вора́ вора́ вора́ вора́ воры́ воры́					✓ neprav ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ neprav ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ne ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ne ✓ ✓ ne
302	GSg 'milk-agaric (mushroom)'	гри́здя	8	3	5	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		гу́здя	13	8	5	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	A/GSg 'goose'	гу́ся					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(kak s ... vod'a)	гу́ся						dop			ne
		гу́ся					✓	✓			✓
303	A/GPl 'horse, steed'	ко́ней						dop poet			ne
		ко́ней	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
304	DPl	ко́ням	0.5	0	0.5	2%					ne
		ко́ням	20.5	11	9.5	98%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	DPl (po ... !) 'mount!'	ко́ням					✓	✓	✓		✓
	GSg 'coal'	у́гля						✓	✓	✓(1)	✓(1)
		у́гля					✓(1)	✓	✓	✓	dop
	N/APl	у́гли					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		у́гли							✓	✓	
	GPl	у́глей						✓	✓	✓	✓
		у́глей					✓		✓	✓	✓
	GSg 'charcoal'	у́гля						✓	✓		
		у́гля							✓		
	N/APl	у́гли						✓	✓		
	GPl	у́глей						✓	✓		
		у́глей						✓	✓		
	N/APl 'remnants of fire'	у́голья						✓	✓		✓
	PPl (sidet' kak na ... )	у́гольях									✓
	GSg 'elbow'	ло́ктя					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ло́ктя						неправ			ne
305	DPl 'brand (for horses, cattle)'	та́врам	14	9	5	78%		✓	✓		

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		тавра́м	4	0	4	22%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	3								
306	GPI 'porch'	кры́лец	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кры́лец	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
307	PPI	кры́льцах	3	3	0	15%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кры́льцах	17	8	9	85%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
	NSg 'sazhen' (=213cm)	са́жень					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		са́жень					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(kosaia ... v plechakh)	са́жень					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	GSg	са́жени					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		са́жени					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	N/API	са́жени					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		са́жени					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	GPI	са́жен					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		са́женей					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		са́женей					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
	DPI	са́жёням					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		са́жёням							✓	✓	dop
	ASg 'excrecence, gall (on trees)'	бо́лону					✓		✓	✓	
		болону́							✓		
308	GPI 'beard'	бо́род	0.5	0	0.5	2%		ne rek		✓	ne
		бо́род	20.5	11	9.5	98%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
309	PPI	бо́родах	6	1	5	29%		ne rek			
		бо́родах	15	10	5	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
310	ASg 'furrow'	бóрозду	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		бороздý	11	6	5	52%		✓	✓	✓	✓
311	GPI	бóрозд	1	1	0	5%		ne rek			ne
		борóзд	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
312	PPI	бóроздах	6	3	3	29%		ne rek			
		борóздах	1	1	0	5%					
		борóздах	14	7	7	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
313	ASg 'harrow'	бóроу	11	4	7	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		боронý	10	7	3	48%		dop	✓		
314	GPI	бóрон	2	2	0	11%		ne rek			
		борóн	17	8	9	89%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	2								
315	PPI	бóронах	2	0	2	10%		ne rek			
		борóнах	1	1	0	5%					
		боронáх	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
316	ASg 'head (body-part)'	гóлову	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
317	ASg 'head (chief person)'	гóлову	1	1	0	5%					
		голóвú	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
318	PPI 'mountain'	гóрах	1	1	0	5%					ne
		горáх	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
319	ASg 'board'	дóску	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		доскú						dop			ne
	(bei v ..., razgoniai tosku) - proverb	доскú					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
320	GPI	дóсок	17.5	9.5	8	83%		dop	✓		ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
321	PP1	досок досках	3.5	1.5	2	17%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
321		досках	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
		досках	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
322	NSg 'crumb'	кроха	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кроха						dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
323	ASg 'crumb'	кроху	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кроху						dop ustar			
324	PP1 'crumb'	крохах	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		крохах							✓	✓	✓
	NSg 'small child'	кроха					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	ASg 'small child'	кроху					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	PP1 'small child'	крохах					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
325	ASg 'stripe, strip'	полосу	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		полосу					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
326	GPI	полос	1	1	0	5%	ne	ne rek			ne
		полос	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
327	IP1	полосами	10	6	4	48%	ne	ne rek			ne
		полосами	11	5	6	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
328	ASg 'time, season'	пору	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пору									ne
329	PP1 'surroundings'	средах	18	10	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		средах	2	1	1	10%					
		x	1								
330	DPI 'Wednesday'	средам	17	10	7	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
		средам	4	1	3	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
331	DP1 'wall'	СТÉНАМ	16	9	7	76%		✓	✓		
		СТЕНА́М	5	2	3	24%	✓	dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
	ASg 'harrow'	скóроду					✓		✓		
		скороду́							✓		
332	dve + GSg 'side'	СТО́роны	1	1	0	5%					ne
		СТО́ронЫ	20	10	10	95%	✓			✓	✓
		СТО́ронЫ					✓	✓	✓		✓
		СТО́ронЫ					✓				✓
		СТО́роны					✓				ne
		СТО́роны					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		СТО́роны					✓	✓	✓		ne
333	ASg 'line'	СТО́роны						✓	✓		✓
		СТО́роны						✓	✓		ne
		СТО́роны						✓	✓		✓
		СТО́роны						✓	✓		✓
		СТО́роны						✓	✓		✓
334	IP1	СТРО́ку	4	0	4	19%				✓	dop
		СТРО́ку	17	11	6	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		СТРО́ку					✓	✓	✓		✓
		СТРО́ками	14	7	7	67%		dop	✓		ne
335	ASg 'cheek'	СТРО́ками	7	4	3	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		СТРО́ками									
336	NSg 'spoon-bait'	Щё́ку	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ЩЕ́ку	2	0	2	10%	✓	✓	✓		
336	NSg 'spoon-bait'	блёсна									ne (5)
		блЕ́сна	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
337	ASg	блѣсну блѣсну блѣсну	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓(6)	ne
338	ASg 'verst'	вѣрсту верстѹ вѣрстах верста́х	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	PPI						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(zhit' v dvukh/tryokh etc ...)						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
339	ASg 'Spring'	весну́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
340	PPI 'water'	во́дах водѣх водѣх	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(vumyt' v tryokh ...)						✓	✓	✓	✓	ustar
	NSg 'dawn; dusk'	за́ря за́рю за́рях за́рях					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1456	ASg PPI		20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
	NSg 'reveille; retreat; tattoo'	за́ря					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	ASg (igrat' / bit' ...)	за́ря за́рю за́рях					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	PPI						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
341	GPI 'land'	зе́мель	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(7)	✓
342	ASg 'peasant hut'	и́збу и́збу	13 8	8 3	5 5	62% 38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
343	ASg 'plait (of hair)'	косу	19	10	9	90%	√	√	√	√	√
		косу́	2	1	1	10%	dop	√(8)	√(8)	√	√
	ASg 'scythe'	косу́					dop	√(8)	√(8)	√	√
		косу́					√	√	√	√	√
344	ASg 'lair, burrow'	но́ру	18	8	10	86%				√	
		но́ру́	3	3	0	14%	√	√	√	√	√
345	ASg 'river'	ре́ку	20	11	9	100%	√	√	√	√	√
		реку́					√	√	√	√	√
		х	1								
346	PP1	ре́ках	19	11	8	90%	√	√	√	√	dop
		река́х	2	0	2	10%	dop ustar	ustar	ustar	√	√
347	ASg 'price'	це́ну	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
		цену́									nc
	GSg (-) 'breast'	гру́ди						dop ustar	ustar	√	√
		груди́					√	√	√	√	√
348	GSg (ot)	от гру́ди									√
		от груди́	21	11	10	100%					√
	GSg (do/iz/okolo/s/u)	гру́ди									√
		груди́									√
	GSg (no prep)	гру́ди									√
	DSg (-)	груди́					dop ustar	ustar	ustar	√	√
350	DSg (no prep)	груди́					√	√	√	√	√
		груди́	20	11	9	100%					√
		х	1								

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
349	DSg (k)	к груді к груді х	1 19 1	0 11	1 8	5% 95%				✓	ustar
	DSg (po)	по груді по груді								✓	ustar
351	PSg (o)	о груді о груді в груді	21	11	10	100%	✓ ✓	dop ustar ustar	ustar	✓ ✓ ✓	ustar
	LSg (v/na)						✓	✓	✓	✓	ustar
	GSg (-) 'axis'	осі осі					✓	✓	✓	✓	ustar
352	GSg (ot)	от осі от осі	3 18	0 11	3 7	14% 86%		dop	ustar		ne
	GSg (u)	у осі					✓				ustar
	GSg (iz)	із осі					✓				
	GSg (s)	с осі					✓				
	GSg (strany/derzhavy)	осі					✓				ustar
	GSg (vokrug svoei ...)	осі					✓	✓			ustar
	DSg (-)	осі осі осі					✓ ✓	ustar ustar	ustar	✓	ustar
353	DSg (k)	к осі к осі	2 19	0 11	2 8	10% 90%		dop			ne
354	DSg (po)	по осі					✓				ustar
	PSg (o)	об осі об осі х	4 16 1	2 8	2 8	20% 80%	✓ dop		ustar	✓	ustar
	LSg (na)	на осі					✓	ustar	ustar	✓	ustar
	LSg (v)	в осі					✓			✓	ustar



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
355	GP1 (-)	о́сей осе́й	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne ✓
	GSg (-) 'steppe'	сте́пи сте́пі					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
356	GSg	из сте́пи из сте́пі	2 19	0 11	2 8	10% 90%					✓
	DSg (-)	сте́пи сте́пі					✓	✓	✓	✓	
357	DSg (k)	к сте́пи к сте́пі	1 19	0 11	1 8	5% 95%					
		х	1								✓
	DSg (po)	по сте́пи по сте́пі					✓			✓	✓
359	PSg (o)	о сте́пи о сте́пі	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
358	LSg (v)	в сте́пи в сте́пі	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne ✓
	GSg (-) 'door'	две́ри двері́					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
360	GSg (ot)	от две́ри от двері́	17 4	8 3	9 1	81% 19%		ne rek			✓
	GSg (do/iz/h)	две́ри двері́					✓		✓	✓	✓
	DSg (-)	две́ри двері́					✓	ne rek			✓
361	DSg (k)	к две́ри к двері́	8 13	4 7	4 6	38% 62%					✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
362	PSg (o)	о дѣри					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v)	в дѣри						✓			
363	LSg (na)	в дѣри	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		на дѣри	8	5	3	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		на дѣри	13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	IPI (-)	дѣрями					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		дѣрьми					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
364	GSg (-) 'bone'	кѡсти	17	10	7	81%					
		кѡсті	4	1	3	19%	✓	neprav	✓	✓	✓
		кѡсти					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кѡсти					✓	neprav	✓	✓	✓
		кѡсті									
365	DSg (k)	к кѡсти	17	9	8	81%					
		к кѡсті	4	2	2	19%					
	DSg (po)	по кѡсти					✓		✓	✓	✓
	PSg (o)	о кѡсти					✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
	LSg (v) (9)	в кѡсти						✓	✓	✓	✓
		в кѡсті									
366	LSg (shirok/tuzok v ...)	в кѡсти	2	1	1	10%					
		в кѡсті	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓		
	LSg (defekt v ...)	в кѡсти					✓				
	LSg (na)	на кѡсти									dop
		на кѡсті									
	IPI	кѡстіаи					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	IPI (lech' ... ) 'to perish in battle'	кѡстіи					✓	✓	✓		
	GSg (-) 'blood'	крѡви					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		крѡві						neprav			



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
367	GSg (no prep) 'blood'	крóви	21	11	10	100%	✓				✓
	GSg (iz)	из крóви					✓		✓		✓
	DSg (-)	крóви						neprav			
368	DSg (po)	пó крoви	0.5	0.5	0	2%					✓
		по крóви	20.5	10.5	10	98%	✓				ne
		по крoвi					✓		✓	✓	✓
	PSg (o)	о крóви					✓		✓	✓	✓
	LSg (na) (10)	на крoвi					✓		✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v)	в крoвi					✓		✓	✓	✓
	GSg (-) 'stove'	пéчи					✓		✓	✓	✓
		пeчiй						dop			
369	GSg (no prep)	пéчи	5	3	2	24%					
		пeчiй	16	8	8	76%	✓				✓
	GSg (ot/iz/u/s)	пéчи					✓		✓	✓	✓
	DSg (-)	пéчи					✓				
		пeчiй						dop			
370	DSg (k)	к пéчи	2	1	1	10%					✓
		к пeчiй	19	10	9	90%	✓				✓
	PSg (o)	о пéчи					✓		✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v/na)	в пeчiй					✓		✓	✓	✓
	LSg (na/v domennoi ...)	пéчи					✓				✓
	GSg (-) 'chain'	цéпи					✓		✓	✓	✓
		цeпiй						ne rek			
371	GSg (no prep)	цéпи	2	1	1	10%					
		цeпiй	19	10	9	90%					
374	GSg (s, eg sorvat'sia/spustit' ...)	с цéпи	2	0	2	10%	✓		✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	DSg (-)	с цепі цѣпи цепі	19	11	8	90%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
372	DSg (k)	к цѣпи к цепі	6 15	3 8	3 7	29% 71%		ne rek			
373	DSg (peredat' po ...)	по́ цепи по цѣпи по цепі	1 1 19	0 0 11	1 1 8	5% 5% 90%	u Pushkina ✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	
	PSg (o)	о цѣпи					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v/na)	в цепі					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
376	LSg (v) 'crack; fissure'	в щѣли в щелі о щѣли	5.5 15.5	3 8	2.5 7.5	26% 74%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
375	PSg (o) GPI	щѣлей щелѣй	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	ne	ne rek ✓	✓	✓	✓
	PSg (o)	о тѣни					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
377	LSg 'shade' (v/na) (11)	в тені	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓ (12)	✓ (12)	✓	✓
378	LSg (v ... dereva)	в тѣни в тені	3 18	3 8	0 10	14% 86%					
	LSg (v/na) 'silhouette'	на тѣни						✓			
379	GPI	тѣней	2	0	2	10%		poet vozm	(13)	ustar	
	GPI (tsarstvo ...)	теней тѣней	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓ (13)	✓	✓
	PSg (o) 'hollow of hand'	о горсті					✓	✓		✓	✓
380	LSg (v)	в горсті в горсті	7.5 13.5	4 7	3.5 6.5	36% 64%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
381	PSg (o) 'cage'	о клі́ті					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v)	в клі́ті	12	6	6	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		в клі́ті	9	5	4	43%		✓	✓	✓	
382	DSg (-) 'network'	се́ті					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	DSg (po)	по се́ті					✓		✓	✓	✓
	PSg (o)	о се́ті					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v)	в се́ті	-21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		в се́ті					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (v ... partinogo prosveshchenia)	се́ті									✓
	Lg (v elektricheskoi ...)	се́ті									✓
383	LSg (na)	на се́ті									✓
	GPI	се́тей					✓	✓	✓	✓	nc
		се́тей									✓
	PSg (o) 'part'	о ча́сти						✓	✓	✓	✓
	LSg (on v ...) (14)	в ча́сти	14	9	5	70%					
384		в ча́сті	6	2	4	30%					
		х	1								
	LSg (v) (9)	в ча́сти									✓
	LSg (v) 'police-station'	в ча́сті								✓	✓
	PSg (o) 'hair, fur, wool, cloth'	о ше́рсті					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
386	LSg (v) 'fluff'	в ше́рсті	11.5	7	4.5	55%					
		в ше́рсті	9.5	4	5.5	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	DSg (-) 'dust'	пи́ли					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	DSg (po)	по пи́ли	8	4	4	38%		✓	✓		













No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+/(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
<b>b) i) Preposition + noun phrases</b>											
		за									
1	'on the flank/side'	за бок	13.5	7	6.5	64%				✓	✓
		за бок	7.5	4	3.5	36%					
2	(eg brosit) 'overboard'	за борт	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(literal, eg zatsepit' - chain) 'onto the deck'	за борт	2	1	1	10%		✓			
		за борт					✓				
3	(eg ot nas) 'a verst away'	за версту						dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		за верстý	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'across the water'	за воду									✓
	'by the hair'	за волос								✓	✓
4	(eg skhvatit'/taskat') 'by the hair'	за волосы	12.5	8	4.5	60%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		за волосы	8.5	3	5.5	40%	✓	✓	✓		
5	(eg zasunut'/nasyapat') 'down the back of s.o.'s shirt'	за ворот	7	5	2	33%	✓	✓	✓		
	(skhvatit') 'by the collar'	за ворот	14	6	8	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
		за ворот						✓	✓		
6	'in the course of a year'	за год	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		за год	1	1	0	5%					
	'a year earlier'	за год					✓	✓	✓		

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+(/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
7	(eg zakinut' ruki/derzhat'sia) 'behind the head'	за голову	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		за голову	4	3	1	19%		✓	✓		
	(skhvati'tsia) 'clasp one's head in shock'	за голову					✓	✓	✓		
	(otvechat' ... kogo-libo) 'to be answerable for s.o.'s life'	за голову					✓				
	'into the countryside'	за город					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'beyond the town' (motion)	за город								✓	✓
	(eg ... Kiev) 'beyond a named town' (motion)	за город					✓				
	'in the countryside'	за городом					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'beyond the town' (location)	за городом								✓	✓
	(eg Kiev) 'beyond a named town' (location)	за городом					✓				
8	(poekhali) 'ambiguous meaning'	за город	19	10	9	90%					
		за город	2	1	1	10%					
9	(ona zhiviot) 'ambiguous meaning'	за городом	15.5	8.5	7	74%					
		за городом	5.5	2.5	3	26%					
10	(eg skryt'sia) 'behind a hill'	за гору	16	9	7	76%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		за гору	5	2	3	24%		dop	✓		
11	'behind the door' (motion)	за дверь	4	3	1	19%				✓	dop
		за дверь	17	8	9	81%				✓	✓
12	'in the course of a day, a day earlier'	за день	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		за день	2	2	0	10%					
	'in the course of a day or two'	за день-два					✓				



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'day after day'	дeнь зa дeнь					√			√	√
13	(beryo/khvataet) 'tugs at someone's heartstrings'	зa дyшy зa дyшy	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√		√
14	'over the winter'	зa зимy зa зимy	19 2	11 0	8 2	90% 10%	√	√	√	√	√
15	(oko za oko) 'a tooth for a tooth'	зyб зa зyб зyб зa зyб	4 17	0 11	4 6	19% 81%	√	√	√	√	√
16	(eg dyorgat/taskat) 'by s.o.'s plait'	зa кocy зa кocy	14.5 6.5	8 3	6.5 3.5	69% 31%	√	√	√	√	
17	(eg dyorgat/taskat) 'by s.o.'s plaits'	зa кocy зa кocy	13.5 7.5	8 3	5.5 4.5	64% 36%	√	√	√	√	
18	'over the summer'	зa лeтo зa лeтo	1.5 19.5	0.5 10.5	1 9	7% 93%	√	√	√	√	√
19	(eg sail away) 'to foreign parts'	зa мope зa мope зa мope	12 9	5 6	7 3	57% 43%	√	√	√	√	√
20	(eg nakhodit'sia) 'overseas'	зa мopeм зa мopeм зa мopeм зa мopeм	11 10	5.5 5.5	5.5 4.5	52% 48%	√	√	√	√	√
	(at a definite distance) 'beyond the sea'						√				√
	(... telushka - polushka, da rubl' perevozu)						√	√			



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
21	'beyond/behind the bridge' (motion)	ЗА МОСТ	1.5	0	1.5	7%			✓	✓	✓
22	'beyond/behind the bridge' (location)	ЗА МОСТ	19.5	11	8.5	93%	✓		✓	dop	dop
		ЗА МОСТОМ							✓	✓	✓
		ЗА МОСТОМ							✓	dop	dop
		ЗА МОСТОМ	21	11	10	100%	✓		✓	dop	dop
	(eg skhvatit'/derzhat') 'by the legs/feet'	ЗА НОГИ					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ЗА НОГИ									
		ЗА НОГУ					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		НОГА ЗА НОГУ					✓	✓	✓		✓
25	(eg vziat'/derzhat') 'by the nose'	ЗА НОС	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓		
		ЗА НОС	1	1	0	5%		dop	✓		
		ЗА НОС					✓	✓			✓
		(vodit') 'to fool somebody'									
26	'overnight'	ЗА НОЧЬ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
27	(posadit' rebyonka komu-nibud') 'on s.o.'s back'	ЗА ПЛЕЧИ	3	0	3	14%		✓(1)	✓	✓	✓
		ЗА ПЛЕЧИ	18	11	7	86%		✓	✓	✓	✓
28	'beyond the field'	ЗА ПОЛЕМ								✓(2)	dop
		ЗА ПОЛЕМ	3	2	1	14%					
		ЗА ПОЛЕМ	18	9	9	86%				dop (2)	✓
29	'after midday'	ЗА ПОЛДЕНЬ	16	7	9	76%	✓	✓	✓	dop	dop
		ЗА ПОЛДЕНЬ	5	4	1	24%		✓	✓	✓	✓
30	'after midnight'	ЗА ПОЛНОЧЬ	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓		

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		за по́лночь	2	2	0	10%			✓		
31	(zatknut' ego) 'ambiguous meaning' (3)	за́ по́яс	1	0.5	0.5	5%					
		за по́яс	19	9.5	9.5	90%					
		за́ п[о]я́с	1	1	0	5%					
	(potianut') lit. 'pull s.o. by the waist'	за по́яс					✓			✓	✓
	(zatknut'/zasunut') 'push/shove sg. under one's belt'	за по́яс					✓		✓	✓	✓
	(zatknut' kogo-nibud') 'outdo s.o.'	за́ по́яс						✓	✓		
32	(eg smotret'/poiti) 'across the river'	за́ реку	16.5	8	8.5	79%	✓		✓	✓	✓
		за́ реку	4.5	3	1.5	21%		dop	✓		
		за́ реку						dop	✓		
33	(eg skhvatiť/vziat'/derzhat') 'by the hands'	за́ руки	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
34	(eg vziat'/derzhat'/vodit') 'by the hand'	за́ руку	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		за́ руку	1	1	0	5%					
35	(bervot) 'moves deeply'	за́ сердце	10	5.5	4.5	48%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		за́ сердце	11	5.5	5.5	52%					
	(khvatat'(sia)) 'moves deeply'	за́ сердце					✓				✓
		за́ сердце					✓				✓
36	'little by little; one thing led to another'	сло́во за́ сло́во	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сло́во за́ сло́во	3	1	2	14%					
37	(eg zalozhit' ruki) 'behind one's back'	за́ спину	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(spriatat'sia ... materi) 'hide behind one's mother's back'	за́ спину					✓				



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah			%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
			No.✓	(/21)	-35 (/11)	35+(/10)					
38	(eg derzhat'sia) 'to the wall'	за́ стену за́ стéну за́ ст[е]ну	9.5 10.5 1	4.5 6.5 0	5 4 1	45% 50% 5%	✓ dop	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
39	(eg zavernut) 'turn the corner'	за́ уго-л за́ уго-л	19 2	9 2	10 0	90% 10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
40	'by the moustache'	за́ ус за́ ўс	4 17	2 9	2 8	19% 81%				✓ ✓	✓ ✓
41	(eg skhvatit'/dyornut') 'by the ear'	за́ уxo за́ ўxo	16 5	10 1	6 4	76% 24%	✓	✓	✓		✓
42	(eg chesat') 'behind the ear'	за́ уxом за́ ўxом	19.5 1.5	11 0	8.5 1.5	93% 7%	✓	✓	✓		
43	(eg skhvatit', dyornut') 'by the ears'	за́ уши за́ ўши (drat') 'jars on the ears'	18.5 2.5	10 1	8.5 1.5	88% 12%	✓	✓	✓(4)		
44	(eg uschipnut/zalozhit') 'on the cheek'	за́ щеку за́ щéку	7.5 13.5	3 8	4.5 5.5	36% 64%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
45	(eg vyiti/soiti) 'onto the bank'	на́ бе́рег на́ бе́рег	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%		✓	✓	✓	✓
46	(eg lech/upast'/povernut'sia) 'onto one's side'	на́ бо́к	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	(lit. eg polozhit' kompress) 'onto s.o.'s flank'	на бок					✓				
	(eg vorochat'sia) 'from side to side'	с бо́ку на́ бок					✓	✓	✓		✓
47	(eg vziat' 'on board'	на́ бор́т	13	7	6	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(lit. eg podniat'sia ... korablia) 'onto the deck'	на́ бор́т	8	4	4	38%		dop	✓		
		на́ бор́т					✓				
48	(nadvinut' 'over one's eyebrows'	на́ брови	1	1	0	5%				✓	dop
		на́ брови	20	10	10	95%	✓			✓	✓
49	(nichego ne vidno) 'a verst' ahead'	на́ версту́									
		на́ версту́	20	11	9	95%				✓	✓
	(oshibsia ... ) 'was wide of the mark'	на́ версту́									✓
		на́ версту́									✓
50	(brosat' slova) 'to talk idly'	на́ ветер	1	0	1	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		на́ ве́тер	20	11	9	95%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
51	'for the evening'	на́ вече́р	1	0	1	5%				✓(2)	dop
		на́ ве́чер	20	11	9	95%	✓			dop(2)	✓
52	(spustit' eg koriabl') '(launch) onto the water'	на́ во́ду	16.5	10	6.5	79%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		на́ во́ду	4.5	1	3.5	21%			✓		
	(eg smotret') 'to look at'	на́ во́ду						✓			
		на́ во́ду						✓			
53	(eg polozhit') 'onto a wagon'	на́ во́з	0.5	0	0.5	2%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		на́ во́з	20.5	11	9.5	98%		✓	✓	✓	✓
54	(ni ... ) 'not in the least'	на́ во́лос	8	4	4	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+(/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		НА ВОЛОС	13	7	6	62%					
55	'onto the hair'	НА ВОЛОСЫ НА ВОЛОСЫ	6 15	5 6	1 9	29% 71%				✓	✓
56	'face to face'	С ГЛАЗУ НА ГЛАЗ С ГЛАЗУ НА ГЛАЗ С ГЛАЗУ НА ГЛАЗ	15 5 1	7 3 1	8 2 0	71% 24% 5%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
57	'for a year'	НА ГОД НА ГОД С ГОДУ НА ГОД ГОД НА ГОД	17 4	9 2	8 2	81% 19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	( ... ne prikhoditsia) 'no two years are alike'						✓				
58	(vyshe) 'head and shoulders above' (eg nadet'/obrushit' - bring down on) 'on s.o.'s head' (postavil' (s nog)) 'turn upside down' (kak sneg ... ) 'like a bolt from the blue'	НА ГОЛОВУ НА ГОЛОВУ НА ГОЛОВУ НА ГОЛОВУ НА ГОЛОВУ НА ГОЛОВУ	12.5 8.5	7 4	5.5 4.5	60% 40%	✓	✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
	( ... krichat') 'to scream at the top of one's voice'	НА ГОЛОС								✓prost	
59	(eg vzoiti/vzbitat'sia) 'uphill' ( ... eg Ararat) 'up a named mountain'	НА ГОРУ НА ГОРУ НА ГОРУ	13.5 7.5	9 2	4.5 5.5	64% 36%	✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓
60	'for a day'	НА ДЕНЬ НА ДЕНЬ	18 3	10 1	8 2	86% 14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+(/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'for a day or two'	НА ДЭНЬ-ДВА́					✓				
	'from one day to the next; any day now'	СО ДНЯ́ НА ДЭНЬ					✓		✓	✓	✓
61	(eg vziai' rabotu) 'to do at home' (eg smotret') 'at the house'	НА́ ДОМ НА́ ДО́М	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
62	'on(to) the board'	НА́ ДОСКУ НА́ ДО́СКУ								✓ dop	✓ ✓
63	(kak bog ... polozhit) 'as the spirit leads' (brat' grekh etc ... ) 'take as one's own responsibility' ( ... naseleniia) 'per capita'	НА́ ДУШУ НА́ ДУ́ШУ НА́ ДУ́ШУ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
64	(podnimat'/pustit') 'set fire to'	НА́ ДЫМ НА́ ДЫ́М	2 19	0 11	2 8	10% 90%				✓	
65	(eg upast') 'to the ground'	НА́ ЗЕМЛЮ НА́ ЗЕМЛЮ́	21	11	10	100%		dop ustar ✓	ustar ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
66	'for winter'	НА́ ЗИМУ НА́ ЗИ́МУ	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
67	( ... ne popadaet) '(one is) shaking severely'	ЗУ́Б НА́ ЗУ́Б ЗУ́Б НА́ ЗУ́Б	19 2	10 1	9 1	90% 10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
68	(posadit') 'on a stake'	НА́ КОЛ НА́ КО́Л	16 5	9 2	7 3	76% 24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
69	(postavit' den'gi) 'in(to) the kitty'	НА́ КО́Н	15	7	8	71%	✓	✓		✓	✓



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		на кóн	6	4	2	29%					
70	(krichat') 'to scream blue murder'	на крік	7	2	5	35%		✓			
		на крік	13	9	4	65%					
		х	1								
71	'for the summer'	на лето	1	0	1	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		на лето	20	11	9	95%		✓	✓	✓	✓
72	'on(to) one's forehead'	на лóб	1	1	0	5%				✓	✓
		на лóб	20	10	10	95%				✓	✓
	(u kogo-to glaza ... lezut) 'someone's eyes are popping out of his head'	на лóб					✓				
73	(pokazat'sia) 'to make an appearance, show oneself'	на люди	13	7	6	62%	✓			✓	✓
		на люди	8	4	4	38%					
	(byt') 'to socialize'	на людях					✓				
74	(eg ekhat' - ASg) 'to the sea-side'	на море	8.5	3	5.5	40%	✓	✓	✓(5)	✓(4)	✓(4)
		на море	12.5	8	4.5	60%		✓	✓(5)		
	(eg smotret') 'at the sea'	на море						✓			
		на море						✓			
75	(dom stoial - LSg) 'on the sea'	на море	2	2	0	10%					
		на море	19	9	10	90%					
	(eg nakhodit'sia - LSg) 'at the seaside'	на море					✓		✓(5)		
		на море					✓		✓(5)		

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	(eg v"ekhat') 'onto the bridge'	НА МОСТ НА МОСТ					√	dop ustar	√		√
76	(eg nakhodit'sia) 'in the sky'	НА НЕБЕ НА НЕБЕ	0.5 20.5	0 11	0.5 9.5	2% 98%	√	√	√	dop √	dop √
77	(eg smotret') 'at the sky'	НА НЕБО НА НЕБО	4 17	4 7	0 10	19% 81%	√	√	√	dop √	dop √
24	(eg nadet') 'on one's legs/feet'	НА НОГМ НА НОГМ	21 21	11 11	10 10	100% 100%	√	√	√	√	√
78	(eg upast', postavit') 'on its feet'						√				
79	(eg nadet') 'on one's leg/foot'	НА НОГУ С НОГМ НА НОГУ	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
23	(eg sidet'/zakinit') 'cross-legged'	НОГА НА НОГУ НОГА НА НОГУ	19 2	9 2	10 0	90% 10%	√	√	√	√	√
80	(eg nadet') 'on one's nose' ie of spectacles	НА НОС НА НОС НА НОС	19.5 1.5	10 1	9.5 0.5	93% 7%	√	dop √	√		√
	(dazhe ... ne nalezaet) 'too small'						√				
81	'for a night'	НА НОЧЬ НА НОЧЬ	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
	(nesmotria ... ) '(although it was) night'						√			√	√
82	(eg posadit' rebyonka komu-nib.) 'on s.o.'s shoulders'	НА ПЛЕЧИ НА ПЛЕЧИ	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	√	√	√	√	√
83	(eg uronit'/upast') 'on/to the ground'	НА ПОЛ НА ПОЛ	20.5 0.5	11 0	9.5 0.5	98% 2%	√	√	√	√	√



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah		-35 (11)		35+/(10)	%total	SU	OS	Zal.	Red.	A&O
			No.√	(21)					1993	1989	1977	1971	1959
84	(eg smotret'/vyiti) 'into the field'	на поле	5.5	3	2.5	26%	√(6)	√	√(6)	√	√(6)	√(6)	√(6)
		на поле	14.5	7	7.5	69%		√	√(6)	√	√(6)	√(6)	√(6)
		на [о]ле	1	1	0	5%							
85	(eg nakhodit'sia) 'in the field'	на поле	2	1	1	10%	√(6)	√	√(6)	√	√(6)	√(6)	√(6)
		на поле	19	10	9	90%		√	√(6)	√	√(6)	√(6)	√(6)
86	(eg smotret'/poiti) 'onto the river'	на реку	11.5	6.5	5	55%	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
		на реку	9.5	4.5	5	45%		dop		√			
		на реку						dop		√			
89	(eg vziat') 'in s.o.'s arms' (peredavat' ... ) 'pass from hand to hand'	на руки с рук на руки	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
87	(eg vziat') 'by the arm', (nadet') 'on one's hand/arm'	на руку	20.5	11	9.5	98%	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
		на руку	0.5	0	0.5	2%							
88	(+D) 'profitable for s.o.' ( ... nechist) 'dishonest/light-fingered' (skor ... ) 'spoiling for a fight/quick at work' (/tiazhyol (okhulki ... ne klast') 'have an eye to the main chance' (eg nalozhit') poviazku ... ) lit. 'on s.o.'s hand'	на руку на руку на руку на руку на руку на руку	21	11	10	100%		√	√	√	√	√	√
90	(polozha ruku ... ) 'hand on heart'	на сердце	13	10	3	62%	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
		на сердце	8	1	7	38%							
	(eg tiazhelo/radostno) 'heavy-hearted, glad-hearted'	на сердце						dop ustar					
		на сердце						√					
	(zhalovat'sia) 'to complain of heart trouble'	на сердце					√				√	√	√
91	(toska eg lezhit'/padaet) 'be/become heavy-hearted'	на сердце	2.5	1	1.5	12%		√	√				
		на сердце	18.5	10	8.5	88%		√	√				





No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'to the sides'	НА стороны								√	√
99	(eg vyiti) 'onto the corner'	НА угол	17	8	9	85%	√	√	√	√	√
		НА угол	3	2	1	15%					
		х	1								
100	(namotat) 'remember well'; (nam. eto sebe ...) 'put that in your pipe and smoke it!'	НА ус	1	1	0	5%		dop ustar	ustar		√(8)
		НА ус	20	10	10	95%		√	√		
101	(eg shepnut) 'in s.o.'s ear'	НА ухо	19	11	8	90%	√	√	√(8)	√(8)	√(8)
	(sdvinut) 'over the ear'	НА ухо	2	0	2	10%		√			
	(slon/medved' ... nastupil) 'to be tone deaf, unmusical'	НА ухо					√	√	√		
	(tugoi) 'hard of hearing'	НА ухо					√	√			
102	(eg nadet/nadvinut) 'on/over the ears'	НА уши	21	11	10	100%	√	√			
103	(na) 'not a jot, etc'	НА фиг	21	11	10	100%	√ prost	√ gr-pro			
104	(eg posadit) 'put on the chain'	НА цепь	3	0.5	2.5	14%			√	√	√
		НА цепь	18	10.5	7.5	86%	√		√	dop	dop
105	'on(to) s.o.'s cheek'	НА щеку	5	2.5	2.5	24%				√	√
		НА щеку	16	8.5	7.5	76%					
		по									
106	(idiom) 'by the wayside, out the window'	ПО боку	21	11	10	100%				√	√

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+(/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	(lit.) 'on the flank, side'	по бо́ку					√				√
107	(eg letet'/razveiat') 'through the air', 'to the winds'	по ветру	14.5	8	6.5	69%	√	√	√		
	(derzhat' nos ... ) 'trim one's sails to the wind'	по вѣтру	6.5	3	3.5	31%	√	√	√		
		по ветру					√		√		
108	(eg idi) 'to fetch water'	по воду	19	9	10	90%	√	√	√	√	√
		по вóду	2	2	0	10%					
109	(v griazi) 'up to one's collar'	по ворот	3	1	2	15%	√		√	√	√
		по вóрот	15	8	7	75%			√		
		по vorót	2	1	1	10%					
		x	1								
110	(eg khodit'/guliat') 'around the courtyard'	по двору	13	6	7	62%	√	√	√	√	√
		по двóру	1	1	0	5%					
		по двору́	7	4	3	33%					
111	(eg udarit') 'on the forehead'	по лбу	17	8	9	81%	√	√	√	√	√
		по лбý	4	3	1	19%			√	√	√
	(chto v lob, chto ... ) 'it comes to the same thing'	по́ лбу					√		√	√	√
	(eg provesti rukoi) 'across one's forehead'	по лбý					√		√	√	√
112	(eg khodit') 'through the forest'	по лесу	17	7	10	81%	√	√	√	√	√
		по лéсу	4	4	0	19%	√	√	√	√	√
113	(eg khodit') 'through the meadow'	по лу́гу	8.5	3	5.5	40%	√	√	√	√	√
		по лу́гу	12.5	8	4.5	60%	√	√	√	√	√



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√(21)	-35 (11)	35+(/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
114	(eg skol'zit') 'on the ice'	по льду по льду	0.5 20.5	0 11	0.5 9.5	2% 98%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	dop ✓	dop ✓
115	(khodit') 'go a-begging' (pustit') 'ruin utterly'	по миру по миру по миру	18.5 2.5	9.5 1.5	9 1	88% 12%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
116	(eg plyt') 'on/across the sea'	по морю по морю	14 7	7 4	7 3	67% 33%	✓ ✓ v pesn	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
	(eg idti) 'along the bridge'	по мосту по мосту по мосту					✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ dop dop	✓ dop dop
117	(eg dvigat'sia/plyt') 'in/across the sky'	по небу по небу	6.5 14.5	2.5 8.5	4 6	31% 69%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	dop ✓	dop ✓
118	(eg shchvolknut' 'flick/stuknut' 'poke') 'on the nose'	по носу по носу по носу по носу	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓ dop	✓ dop	✓ dop	✓ dop	✓ dop
119	(ne) 'not fitting/appropriate' (poluchit' ... ) fig. 'get it on the nose'						✓				✓
120	(eg khodit'/lazit') 'across/along the floor'	по полу по полу	17.5 3.5	9 2	8.5 1.5	83% 17%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
121	(eg khodit') 'across/around the garden'	по саду	8 13	3 8	5 5	38% 62%	✓ dop	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+/(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		по сáду	21	11	10	100%		√		√	√
122	(eg brodit'/skitat'sia) 'around the world'	по́ свету	2	1	1	10%		dop ustar	ustar		
		по́ свету	19	10	9	90%	√	√	√		
123	(+D) 'be fond of s.o.'	по́ сердцу	14	5	9	67%	√	√	√	√razg	
	(kak nozhom ... ) 'referring to a terrible feeling'	по́ сердцу	7	6	1	33%					
		по́ сердцу					√				
124	(eg ekhat'/iditi) 'through the snow'	по́ снегу	3	1	2	14%		√	√	√	√
		по́ снегу	18	10	8	86%		√	√		√
125	(eg udarit' kulakom) 'on the table'	по́ столу	11	5	6	52%		√	√	√	√
	(eg postavit' ... v kazhdoi komnate)	по́ столу	10	6	4	48%		√	√		√
126	(eg udarit') 'on the ear'	по́ уху	19	9	10	90%	√	√	√		√
		по́ уху	2	2	0	10%		dop			
127	'head over heels (in love)/very (busy)'	по́ уши	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√		√(8)
		из									
128	(eg upustit'/skryt'sia) 'out of sight'	из́ виду	2	0	2	10%	√	√	√	√	√
		из́ виду	19	11	8	90%		dop	√		
129	'year in, year out'	из́ году в год	3	1	2	17%		√	√		√
		из́ году в год	14	8	6	78%					
		из́ году в год	1	1	0	6%					



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukrainian No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		х	3				√	√	√		dop
		из го́да в го́д									
130	'out of one's home'	і́з до́му	15.5	10	5.5	74%	√	√	√	√	√
		из до́му	5.5	1	4.5	26%		√	√		
		из до́ма					√	√	√		
	'out of the house'	из до́ма					√				√
131	(eg iditi/prinesti) 'out of/from the forest'	і́з ле́су	5	3	2	24%	√	√	√	√	√
		из ле́су	16	8	8	76%		√	√		
		из ле́са					√	√	√	√	√
132	(eg techyot) 'out of s.o.'s nose'	і́з но́су	11.5	6	5.5	55%	√	√	√		√
		из но́су	9.5	5	4.5	45%		√	√		
		из но́са					√	√	√		
	(khot' krov' ... ) 'no matter how hard'	і́з но́су					√				
133	'day in, day out'	і́зо дня́ в де́нь	6	3	3	29%		dop	√		
		изо дня́ в де́нь	15	8	7	71%		√	√		√
134	'out of s.o.'s mouth'	і́зо рту́	3	2	1	27%			ustar	√	√
		изо рту́	8	5	3	73%					
		х	10								
		изо рта́					√	√	√	√	√
		без									
135	(propast') 'to disappear'	бе́з ве́сти	21	11	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
		без ве́сти						neprav		√	ne

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
136	( ... nedelia) 'a very short time; very young'	бэз году х	20 1	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
137	'without salt'	бэз соли бэз со́ли бэз со́ли	21	11	10	100%				✓	
	(anekdot) 'unfunny joke, poor anecdote'									✓	
138	'to no avail, it's no good'	бэз толку бэз то́лку	17 4	8 3	9 1	81% 19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
139	'a quarter to'	бэз четверти бэз чётверти	21	11	10	100%			✓	✓	
		до									
140	'as far as home, to one's home'	до́ дому до до́му до до́ма до до́ма до до́ма	4 17	3 8	1 9	19% 81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'to the house'						✓				✓
141	(eg izbit'/rasshibit'/nateret') 'until it bled'	до́ крови до кро́ви до кро́ви	15 5 1	8 2 1	7 3 0	71% 24% 5%	✓	✓	✓		
142	(s verxu ... ) 'from top to bottom' adverb 'to the bottom'	до́ низу до́низу	21	11	10	100%				✓(9)	✓
143	'until nightfall'	до́ ночи до но́чи	16 4	9 2	7 2	76% 19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'from morn till night'	д[о] н[о]чи с утр[а] д[о] н[о]чи	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
144	(eg viset'/poklonit'sia) 'down to the floor, ground'	д[о] п[о]лу д[о] п[о]лу д[о] п[о]ла	12.5 8.5	6 5	6.5 3.5	60% 40%	✓ dop dop	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
145	'very early'	д[о] с[в]ету д[о] с[в]ету х	9 11 1	6 5	3 6	45% 55%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
146	(eg ustal'/botat'sia) 'to death, ie very'	д[о] с[м]ерти д[о] с[м]ерти д[о] с[м]ерти д[о] с[м]ерти	16 5	8 3	8 2	76% 24%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
147	'up until now'	д[о] с[и]х п[о]р д[о] с[и]х п[о]р д[о] с[и]х п[о]р х	8 12 1	4 6	4 6	40% 60%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
	'up until then'	д[о] т[е]х п[о]р д[о] т[е]х п[о]р д[о] т[е]х п[о]р д[о] т[е]х п[о]р с									ne ✓
148	(szhit'/sognat') 'be the death of'	с[о] с[в]ету	13.5	5.5	8	64%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓





No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		ПОД МОСТОМ ПОД МОСТОМ	21	11	10	100%	✓		✓	dop dop	
157	(eg podlozhit') 'under s.o.'s leg/foot'	ПОД НОГУ ПОД НОГУ	10.5 10.5	5 6	5.5 4.5	50% 50%	✓				✓
158	(eg brosit') 'under s.o.'s feet/legs'	ПОД НОГИ ПОД НОГИ ПОД НОГИ	15 6	6 5	9 1	71% 29%		✓ dop ✓	✓ ✓		✓
159	(govorit' sebe ... ) 'speak very quietly, mutter'	ПОД НОС ПОД НОС	7 14	3 8	4 6	33% 67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
160	'very nearby' (eto u tebia ... proiskhodit) 'under one's very nose' (lit.) 'under s.o.'s nose' (likhoradka ... ) 'there is a cold-sore under your etc nose'	ПОД НОСОМ ПОД НОСОМ ПОД НОСОМ ПОД НОСОМ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
161	(eg spriatat/postavit') 'in the cellar' (motion)	ПОД ПОЛ ПОД ПОЛ	13 8	7 4	6 4	62% 38%	✓		✓	✓	dop
162	(eg khranit') 'in the cellar' (location)	ПОД ПОЛОМ ПОД ПОЛОМ x	7 13 1	5 5	2 8	35% 65%	✓				✓ dop
163	(eg idti) 'arm in arm/(vziat'/derzhat') take/hold s.o.'s arm' (skazat') 'disturb, annoy s.o. by saying sg.'	ПОД РУКУ ПОД РУКУ ПОД РУКУ	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah				%total	SU	OS	Zal.	Red.	A&O
			No.√	(21)	-35	(11)	35+/(10)					
164	(eg vziat'/vesti) 'by their/our etc arms'	пóд руки под рѹки	20	1	10	10	95%	√	√	√	√	√
		о					5%					
165	'side by side'	бóк о бок	21	11	10	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
166	'side by side' (of ships)	бóрт о борт бóрт о бóрт бóрт [о] бóрт	12 8 1	7 4 0	5 4 1	5 4 1	57% 38% 5%	√		√	√	√
167	'side by side' (of horses)	кóнь о кóнь кóнь о кóнь	8 13	4 7	4 6	4 6	38% 62%				√	
		о б										
168	(eg udarit') 'against the floor'	о́б пол о́б пóл	15 6	8 3	7 3	7 3	71% 29%	√	√	√	√	√
169	(eg idti) 'hand in hand'	рука́ о́б руку	21	11	10	10	100%	√	√	√	√	√
	'against the back of s.o.'	о́б спину о́б спíну									√	dop
170	'against the wall' (lit.)	о́б стéну о́б стéну х	20 1	11	9	9	100%				√	√
	(kak ... gorokh) 'pointlessly'	о́б стéну						√	√	√	√	√



No.	Meaning	Phrase	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+/(10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		от									
171	'with each passing year'	год от году	10	5	5	48%			✓		✓
		год от году	11	6	5	52%		✓	✓		
		год от года					✓	✓	✓		dop
172	(certain number of years) 'old'	от року	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
	adverb (certain number of years) 'in age'	отроку					✓	✓	✓		✓
173	(ne legche) 'it gets worse by the hour'	час от часу	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		час от часу	1	0	1	5%					
		при									
174	'on one's death-bed'	при смерти	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		у									
175	'by the sea'	у моря									
		у моря	21	11	10	100%					
	(sides' ... i zhdai' pogody) 'let the grass grow under one's feet'	у моря								✓	✓
		в									
176	'in a field' (in folk poetry)	во поле	20	10	10	95%	✓v pesn	✓(11)			✓v pesn
		во поле	1	1	0	5%					
177	(kak kur ... ) 'got into a mess'	во щи	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓





No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		<b>b) ii) Preposition + numeral phrases</b>									
		Key to abbreviations used in this table:									
		<b>Code</b>									
		<b>Meaning</b>									
		<b>Examples</b>									
	P+Num+N	Preposition + numeral + noun									
	P+Num%	Preposition + numeral (sentence-final)									
	P+cpdNum	Preposition + compound or further defined numeral									
	P+appNum	Preposition + approximate numeral									
	N+P+Num%	Noun + preposition + numeral (sentence-final)									
		за									
178	P+Num+N	за восемь	1	0	1	5%					
		за восемь	20	11	9	95%					
212	P+Num%	за восемь	20	11	9	100%		✓	✓		✓
		за восемь	1					✓			
		x									
179	P+Num+N	за два	5	1	4	24%	✓				
		за два	15	9	6	71%					
		за дв[а]	1	1	0	5%					
213	P+Num%	за два	10	4	6	48%		✓	✓		✓
		за два	11	7	4	52%		✓			
	P+appNum	за два					✓				

No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
180	P+Num+N	за́ две	5	2	3	25%					
		за́ двé	15	9	6	75%					
		x	1								
214	P+Num%	за́ две	11	4	7	52%		✓			✓
		за́ двé	10	7	3	48%		✓			
181	P+Num+N	за́ двое	1	0	1	5%			✓		
		за́ двоé	20	11	9	95%			✓		
215	P+Num%	за́ двое	11	4	7	52%		✓			
		за́ двоé	10	7	3	48%		✓			
182	P+Num+N	за́ де́вять	21	11	10	100%	✓				
216	P+Num%	за́ де́вять						✓	✓		✓
		за́ де́вять	21	11	10	100%		✓			dop
	P+appNum	за́ де́вять					✓				
	N+P+Num%	за́ де́вять					✓				
183	P+Num+N	за́ де́сять	21	11	10	100%	✓				
217	P+Num%	за́ де́сять						✓	✓	✓	✓
		за́ де́сять	21	11	10	100%		✓			dop
	P+cpdNum	за́ де́сять					✓				
	N+P+Num%	за́ де́сять					✓				
184	P+Num+N	за́ пять	5	5	0	24%	✓(1)				
		за́ пять	16	6	10	76%					
218	P+Num%	за́ пять	4	2	2	19%		✓	✓		✓
		за́ пять	17	9	8	81%		✓			
	P+appNum	за́ пять					✓				



No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
185	P+Num+N	за́ се́мь	1	1	0	5%	✓				
		за се́мь	20	10	10	95%					
219	P+Num%	за́ се́мь	2.5	1	1.5	12%		✓	✓		✓
		за се́мь	18.5	10	8.5	88%		✓			
	P+appNum	за се́мь					✓				
	P+Num+N	за со́рок ру́блей									✓
	P+Num%	за́ со́рок						dop ustar			✓
		за со́рок						✓			✓
186	dat+P+Num+N	за со́рок ле́т	20	11	9	95%					
		за́ c[о]рок ле́т	1	0	1	5%					
220	dat+P+Num%	за́ со́рок							✓		✓
		за со́рок	21	11	10	100%	✓		✓		
	P+cpdNum	за со́рок									✓
187	P+Num+N	за́ сто	1	1	0	5%					✓
		за́ сто	20	10	10	95%					
221	P+Num%	за́ сто	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓		
		за́ сто	18	9	9	86%		✓			
	P+cpdNum	за́ сто					✓				✓
188	P+Num+N	за́ три	10	4	6	48%	✓				
		за́ три	11	7	4	52%					
222	P+Num%	за́ три	9	4	5	43%		✓	✓		✓
		за́ три	12	7	5	57%		✓			
	P+appNum	за́ три					✓				
189	P+Num+N	за́ трое	1	1	0	5%			✓		
		за́ трое	19	9	10	90%			✓		

No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
223	P+Num%	за тр[о]е	1	1	0	5%					
		за трое	11.5	5.5	6	55%		✓			
		за трое	8.5	4.5	4	40%		✓			
		за тр[о]е	1	1	0	5%					
190	P+Num+N	за шесть	4	3	1	19%					
		за шéсть	17	8	9	81%	✓				
224	P+Num%	за шесть	2	1	1	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		за шéсть	18	9	9	86%		✓			
		за шéсть	1	1	0	5%					
	P+appNum	за шéсть					✓				
	N+P+Num	за шéсть					✓				
		на									
191	P+Num+N	на вóсемь	21	11	10	100%					
225	P+Num%	на вóсемь	1	0	1	5%		✓	✓		✓
		на вóсемь	20	11	9	95%		✓			
192	P+Num+N	на два	2	1	1	10%	✓				
		на двá	19	10	9	90%					
226	P+Num%	на два	11	4	7	52%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		на двá	10	7	3	48%		✓			
	P+appNum	на двá					✓				
	P+cpdNum	на двá					✓				
193	P+Num+N	на две	2	1	1	10%					
		на двé	19	10	9	90%					
227	P+Num%	на две	11	5	6	52%		✓			✓



No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		на две	10	6	4	48%		✓			
194	P+Num+N	на двое	2	2	0	10%			✓		
		на двое	19	9	10	90%			✓		
228	P+Num%	на двое	15	8	7	71%		✓		✓	
		на двое	6	3	3	29%		✓		✓	
	adverb	на двое						✓	✓		✓
		на двое									nc
195	P+Num+N	на девять	20	10	10	100%					
		x	1								
229	P+Num%	на девять					✓	✓	✓		✓
		на девять	21	11	10	100%		✓			dop
	P+cpdNum	на девять					✓				
	P+appNum	на девять					✓				
	N+P+Num%	на девять					✓				
196	P+Num+N	на десять	21	11	10	100%					
230	P+Num%	на десять						✓	✓	✓	✓
		на десять	21	11	10	100%		✓			dop
	P+cpdNum	на десять					✓				
	P+appNum	на десять					✓				
	N+P+Num%	на десять					✓				
197	P+Num+N	на пять	3	2	1	14%	✓				
		на пять	18	9	9	86%					
231	P+Num%	на пять	3	2	1	14%	✓(2)	✓	✓		✓
		на пять	18	9	9	86%		✓			
	P+appNum	на пять					✓				

No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
198	P+Num+N	há сѣмь	8	5	3	38%					
		há сѣмь	13	6	7	62%					
232	P+Num%	há сѣмь	4	1	3	19%	✓(2)	✓	✓		✓
		há сѣмь	17	10	7	81%		✓			
	P+appNum	há сѣмь					✓				
199	P+Num+N	há сорок	21	11	10	100%					
233	P+Num%	há сорок									✓
		há сорок	21	11	10	100%	✓(2)				✓
200	P+Num+N	há сто	5	3	2	24%					✓
		há сто	13	6	7	62%					
		há ст[o]	3	2	1	14%					
234	P+Num%	há сто	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓	✓		
		há сто	12	7	5	57%		✓			
	P+cpdNum	há сто					✓				✓
201	P+Num+N	há три	9	6	3	43%	✓				
		há три	12	5	7	57%					
235	P+Num%	há три	10	3	7	48%	✓(2)	✓	✓		✓
		há три	11	8	3	52%		✓			
	P+appNum	há три					✓				
202	P+Num+N	há трое							✓		
		há трое	21	11	10	100%			✓		
	P+Num%	há трое						✓			
		há трое						✓			
	adverb	háтрое					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
203	P+Num+N	на шéсть	21	11	10	100%	√				
236	P+Num%	на шéсть	5	3	2	24%	√(2)	√	√	√	√
		на шéсть	16	8	8	76%		√			
	P+appNum	на шéсть					√				
		по									
204	P+Num+N	по́ два	6	2	4	29%	√				
		по́ два́	15	9	6	71%					
237	P+Num%	по́ два	12.5	5	7.5	60%		√	√		√
		по́ два́	8.5	6	2.5	40%		√			
	P+appNum	по́ два́					√				
205	P+Num+N	по́ две	3	1	2	14%					
		по́ две́	18	10	8	86%					
238	P+Num%	по́ две	11.5	5	6.5	55%		√			√
		по́ две́	9.5	6	3.5	45%		√			
206	P+Num+N	по́ двое	3	2	1	14%					
		по́ дво́е	18	9	9	86%					
239	P+Num%	по́ двое	10.5	6	4.5	50%	√(2)	√	√	√	
		по́ дво́е	10.5	5	5.5	50%		√			
	P+appNum	по́ дво́е					√(3)				
207	P+Num+N	по́ сто	1	0	1	5%					
		по́ сто́	20	11	9	95%					
240	P+Num%	по́ сто	6	4	2	29%		√	√		√
		по́ сто́	15	7	8	71%		√			avg

No.	Comments	Phrase	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
208	P+Num+N	по́ три	6	2	4	29%	√				
		по́ три́	15	9	6	71%					
241	P+Num%	по́ три	8.5	4	4.5	40%		√	√		√
		по́ три́	12.5	7	5.5	60%		√			
	P+Num%(4)	по́ три					√				
	P+appNum	по́ три́					√				
209	P+Num+N	по́ трое	2	1	1	10%					
		по́ трое́	19	10	9	90%					
242	P+Num%	по́ трое	7	2	5	33%		√	√		
		по́ трое́	14	9	5	67%		√			
		до́									
	P+Num+N	до́ ста									√
243	P+Num%(5)	до́ ста									√
		до́ ста́	21	11	10	100%	√	dop ustar(6) √(6)	ustar √		
	P+cpxdNum	до́ ста́									√
		с									
	P+Num+N	со́ ста рублёй									√
		со́ ста́ рублёй					√				√
	P+Num+N	со́ ста́ рубля́ми					√				√
244	P+Num%(5)	со́ ста									
		со́ ста́	18	9	9	100%		dop ustar(6) √(6)			
		х	3								





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
<b>c) i) Verbs: past and pppS</b>											
		<b>-дать</b>									
	'give'						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
848		дál						neprav			ne
		дáла					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
849		далá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		далó	2	1	1	10%					
		далó	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
850		дали	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		дán					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
851		данá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
852		данó	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
853		дány	4	2	2	19%					
		данý	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
854	'give back'	отдал	14	4	10	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
		отдál	7	7	0	33%		dop	✓	razg	razg
855		отдала						neprav			ne
		отдалá						neprav			ne
		отдалá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
856		отдалó	6	3	3	32%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		отдалó	1	0	1	5%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		отдалó	12	6	6	63%		ne rek			ne
		х	2								
857		отдали	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		отдали	11	6	5	52%		dop	✓	razg	razg



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. √ (21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
858		отдан	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
859		отдана	10	5	5	48%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		отданá	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
860		отдано	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
861		отданы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		отданý						neprav			
862	'publish; issue'	издал	2	1	1	10%				(2)	
		издáл	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
863		издáла	5	2	3	24%		neprav			ne
		издáлá	16	9	7	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
864		издало	4	0	4	19%					
		издáло	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		издалó	5	4	1	24%		ne rek			ne
865		издали	2	1	1	10%					
		издáли	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
866		издан	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
867		издана	18	9	9	86%		dop	✓		dop
		изданá	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
868		издано	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		изданó	2	2	0	10%					
869		изданы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		изданý						neprav			
870	'pass; broadcast'	пéредал	4	1	3	19%	✓	✓	✓	√(1)	✓
		перéдал						neprav			ne
		передáл	17	10	7	81%		dop	✓	razg	razg
871		пéредала						neprav			ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		перéдала						neprav			ne
		передáла						neprav			ne
		передалá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
872		пéредало	4	1	3	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéдало						neprav			ne
		передáло	7	4	3	33%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		передало́	10	6	4	48%		ne rek			ne
873		пéредали	4	2	2	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéдали						neprav			ne
		передáли	17	9	8	81%		dop	✓	razg	razg
874		péредан	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéдан					ne	neprav			ne
875		péредана	18	9	9	86%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		перéдана					ne	neprav			ne
		переданá	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
876		péредано	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéдано					ne	neprav			ne
		передано́	1	1	0	5%					
877		пéреданы	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéданы					ne	neprav			ne
		переданы́	1	1	0	5%		neprav			
	'give too much'	перéдал						neprav			
		передáл						✓			
		перéдала						neprav			
		передáла						neprav			
		передалá						✓			
		передало́						neprav			



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		передало						✓			
		передало́						ne rek			
		передали						neprav			
		передали́						✓			
		передан						✓			
		передан						neprav			
		передана						dop			
		передана						neprav			
		передана́						✓			
		передано						✓			
		передано́						neprav			
		переданы						✓			
		переданы						neprav			
		переданы́						neprav			
878	'attach; lend'	придал	3	1	2	14%	✓	dop ust	✓	✓(1)	✓
		придал	18	10	8	86%		✓	✓	razg	razg
879		придала	1	0	1	5%		neprav			ne
		придала	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		придала́	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
880		придало	2	0	2	10%	✓	dop ust	✓	✓	✓
		придало́	6	4	2	29%		✓	✓	razg	razg
		придало́	13	7	6	62%		ne rek			ne
881		придали	1.5	0	1.5	7%	✓	dop ust	✓	✓	✓
		придали́	19.5	11	8.5	93%		✓	✓	razg	razg
882		придан	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		придан	3	2	1	14%					

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
883		при́дана	7	5	2	33%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		прида́на	14	6	8	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
884		при́дано	19	10	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прида́но	1	0	1	5%					
		х	1								
885		при́даны	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прида́ны	2	2	0	10%		neprav			
		<b>-создать</b>									
886	'create; establish'	созда́л	15	8	7	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		созда́л	6	3	3	29%		dop	✓	razg	razg
887		созда́ла						neprav			ne
		созда́ла	1	1	0	5%		neprav			ne
		созда́ла	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
888		созда́ло	11	6	5	55%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		созда́ло	4	2	2	20%		dop	✓	razg	razg
		созда́ло	5	2	3	25%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								
889		созда́ли	12	6	6	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		созда́ли	9	5	4	43%		dop	✓	razg	razg
890		созда́н	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
891		созда́на	17.5	9.5	8	83%		dop	✓		razg
		созда́на	3.5	1.5	2	17%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
892		созда́но	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
893		созда́ны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		созда́ны						neprav			



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
894	're-create; reconstruct'	воссоздал	5	2	3	24%					
		воссоздал	16	9	7	76%	✓	✓	✓		✓
895		воссоздала	3	0	3	14%					
		воссоздала	6	4	2	29%		neprav			ne
		воссоздала	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
896		воссоздало	4	0	4	20%					
		воссоздало	7	5	2	35%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		воссоздало	9	6	3	45%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								
897		воссоздали	8	3	5	38%					
		воссоздали	13	8	5	62%	✓	✓	✓		✓
898		воссоздан	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
899		воссоздана	19	9	10	90%		dop	✓		razg
		воссоздана	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓		✓
900		воссоздано	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
901		воссозданы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		воссозданы						neprav			
		-звать									
		звал					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
902	'call; summon'	звала						neprav			ne
		звала	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
903		звало	7	3	4	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		звало	14	8	6	67%		ne rek			ne
904		звали	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		зван					✓	✓	✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
905		зв́ана	5	4	1	24%					
		звана́	16	7	9	76%	✓	✓	✓		✓
906		зв́ано	12	8	4	57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		звано́	9	3	6	43%					
907		зв́аны	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		званы́	4	2	2	19%					
908	'name'	назва́л	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
909		назва́ла	4	2	2	19%		neprav			ne
		назва́ла́	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
910		назва́ло	9	4	5	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		назва́ло́	11	6	5	55%		ne rek			ne
		x	1								
911		назва́ли	20	11	9	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
912		на́зван	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
913		на́звана	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		названа́	3	2	1	14%		dop ust	ustar	ustar	ustar
914		на́звано	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
915		на́званы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-вра́ть									
		вра́л					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
916	'lie'	вра́ла						neprav			ne
		вра́ла́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
917		вра́ло	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		вра́ло́	16	9	7	76%		ne rek			ne





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'lie'	лгáл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
930		лгáла						neprav			ne
		лгáла́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
931		лгáло	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		лгáло́	16	9	7	76%		ne rek			ne
932		лгáли	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		лгáли́	1	0	1	5%					
933	'slander'	налгáл	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
934		налгáла	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		налгáла́	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
935		налгáло	7	1	6	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		налгáло́	14	10	4	67%		ne rek			
936		налгáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		<b>-рвать</b>									
937	'tear'	рва́л					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		рва́ла						neprav			ne
		рва́ла́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
938		рва́ло	2.5	0	2.5	12%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		рва́ло́	17.5	10	7.5	88%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								
939		рва́ли	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		рва́ли́	1	1	0	5%					
940	'tear off'	оторва́л	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
941		оторва́ла	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
942		оторвалá	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		оторвалó	6	1	5	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
943		оторвалó	15	10	5	71%		ne rek			ne
		оторвалí	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		оторвалí	1	0	1	5%					
944	'pick (a quantity of)'	нарвалá	19	11	8	100%	✓(3)	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓(3)
		х	2								
945		нарвалá	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		нарвалá	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
946		нарвалó	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		нарвалó	12	7	5	57%		ne rek			ne
947		нарвалí	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		нарвалá						✓	✓		
	'fester'	нарвалá						neprav			
		нарвалá						✓	✓		
		нарвалá						✓	✓		
		нарвалó						dop	✓		
		нарвалí						✓	✓		
		-ткать									
		ткáл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
948	'weave'	ткáла	3	1	2	14%		dop	✓		dop
		ткáла	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
949		ткáло	8	3	5	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ткáло	12	7	5	60%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
950		ткáли ткaлi	20 1	11 0	9 1	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
951	'interweave'	вóткaл вoткáл x	1 18 2	0 9	1 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
952		вóткaлa вoткáлa вoткaлá x	1 11 8 1	0 6 4	1 5 4	5% 55% 40%	✓	dop ✓	✓ ✓	✓	dop ✓
953		вóткaлo вoткáлo вoткaлó x	1 15 4 1	0 9 2	1 6 2	5% 75% 20%	✓	✓ ne rek	✓	✓	✓ ne
954		вoткáли x	20 1	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-бpáть									
955	'take'	бpáл бpáлa бpáлá бpáлo бpáлó бpáли	21 21 3 18 21	11 11 1 10 11	10 10 2 8 10	100% 100% 14% 86% 100%	✓	✓ neprav ✓ ✓ ne rek ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ne ✓ ✓ ne ✓	✓ ne ✓ ne ✓
956											
957											
958											
959	'take (a quantity of)'	пoбpáл x	19 2	11	8	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
960		пoбpáлa	4	3	1	21%		neprav			ne



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		побралá	15	8	7	79%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	2								
961		побрáло	10	5	5	56%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		побрáло	8	5	3	44%		ne rek			ne
		х	3								
962		побрáли	19	11	8	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	2								
963	'take away'	убрál	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
964		убрáла	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		убрálá	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
965		убрáло	12	8	4	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		убрало	9	3	6	43%		ne rek			ne
966		убрáli	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
967		убран	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
968		убрана	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		убранá	1	1	0	5%		dop ust	ustar	ustar	ustar
969		убрано	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
970		убраны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-драть									
971	'tear up'	дрáл	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
972		дрáла	1	0	1	5%		neprav			ne
		дралá	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
973		дрáло	2	0	2	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		драло	19	11	8	90%		ne rek			ne
974		дрáli	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
975	'tear to pieces'	задрáл	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
976		задрáла	3	2	1	14%		neprav			ne
		задрáлá	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
977		задрáло	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		задрáлó	11	6	5	52%		ne rek			ne
978		задрáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-гнáть									
		гнáл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
979	'drive; persecute; hunt'	гнáла	1	0	1	5%		neprav			ne
		гнáлá	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
980		гнáло	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		гнáлó	10	5	5	48%		ne rek			ne
981		гнáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
982	'catch up with'	догнáл	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
983		догнáла	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		догнáлá	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
984		догнáло	8.5	4.5	4	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		догнáлó	12.5	6.5	6	60%		ne rek			ne
985		догнáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-ждáть									
		ждáл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'wait for'	ждáла						neprav			ne
986		ждáлá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
987		ждáло	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ждáло	16	9	7	76%		ne rek			ne
988		ждáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
989	'wait for s.o.'	прождáл	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
		х	1								
990		прождáла	3	2	1	15%		neprav			ne
		прождáла	17	8	9	85%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
991		прождáло	14	7	7	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прождáло	7	4	3	33%		ne rek			ne
992		прождáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-спать									
		спáл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
993	'sleep'	спáла						neprav			ne
		спáла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
994		спáло	5	3	2	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		спáло	16	8	8	76%		ne rek			ne
995		спáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
996	'oversleep'	проспáл	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
997		проспáла	1	0	1	5%		neprav			ne
		проспáла	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
998		проспáло	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		проспáло	12	7	5	57%		ne rek			ne
999		проспáли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1010		зачало зачало зачало х	4 7 9 1	2 4 5	2 3 4	20% 35% 45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1011		зачали зачали	4 17	2 9	2 8	19% 81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1012		зачат зачат	6 15	3 8	3 7	29% 71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1013		зачата зачата	2 15	1 9	1 6	10% 71%	dop	✓	✓	ne	✓
1014		зачата зачато	4 5	1 2	3 3	19% 24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1015		зачато зачаты зачаты	16 5 16	9 2 9	7 3 7	76% 24% 76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1016	'begin'	почал почал х	1 18 2	1 9	0 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1017		почала почала	6 13	4 6	2 7	32% 68%	neprav	✓	✓	ne	✓
1018		х почало почало почало х	2 1 12 6 2	1 5 4	0 7 2	5% 63% 32%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1019		почало почали почали	2 17	1 9	1 8	11% 89%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		x	2								
1020		пóчат	3	1	2	16%		dop ust	✓	✓	✓
		пoчáт	16	9	7	84%	✓	✓		dop	dop
		x	2								
1021		пóчaтa	1	1	0	5%					ne
		пoчáтa	16	8	8	84%		✓			ne
		пoчaтá	2	1	1	11%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	2								
1022		пóчaтo	3	1	2	16%		dop ust	✓	✓	✓
		пoчáтo	16	9	7	84%	✓	✓		dop	dop
		x	2								
1023		пóчaты	3	1	2	16%		dop ust	✓	✓	✓
		пoчáты	16	9	7	84%	✓	✓		dop	dop
		x	2								
		<b>взятъ</b>									
	'take'	взѣл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1024		взѣла						neprav			ne
		взѣлá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1025		взѣлo	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		взѣлó	16	9	7	76%		dop	✓		ne
1026		взѣли	20	11	9	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
		взѣт					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1027		взѣтa	6	4	2	29%		neprav			ne
		взѣтá	15	7	8	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1028		взято	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		взято	3	2	1	14%		неправ			ne
1029		взяты	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		взяты						неправ			ne
		-нять									
1030	'embrace'	обнял	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обнял	3	2	1	14%		доп	✓	razg	razg
1031		обняла						неправ			ne
		обняла						неправ			ne
		обняла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1032		обняло	7	2	5	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обняло	1	1	0	5%		доп	✓	razg	razg
		обняло	13	8	5	62%		не рек	✓	✓	ne
1033		обняли	13	7	6	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обняли	7	4	3	33%		доп	✓	razg	razg
		обняли	1	0	1	5%					
1034		обнят	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		обнят	3	3	0	14%		неправ			ne
1035		обнята	11	5	6	52%		не рек			ne
		обнята	5	2	3	24%		неправ			ne
		обнята	5	4	1	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1036		обнято	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обнято	3	2	1	14%		неправ			ne
1037		обняты	17	9	8	89%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обняты	2	1	1	11%		неправ			ne
		х	2								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'imitate, copy (coll.)'	пéренял					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéнял						neprav			
		переня́л						dop	✓	razg	razg
		пéреняла						neprav			ne
		перéняла						neprav			
		переня́ла						neprav	✓	✓	ne
		перенял́а	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пéреняло						neprav			
		переня́ло						dop	✓	razg	razg
		перенял́о						ne tek	✓	✓	ne
		пéреняли	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		переня́ли						neprav			
		переня́ли						dop	✓	razg	razg
		пéренят					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéнят						neprav			
		переня́т						neprav			ne
		пéренята						ne tek			ne
		переня́та						neprav			
		переня́та						neprav			ne
		переня́та	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пéренято	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		переня́то						neprav			
		переня́то						neprav			ne
		пéреняты						neprav			✓
		переня́ты	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		переня́ты						neprav			ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	'take; accept'	прѣнял					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣял						neprav			ne
		прѣняла						neprav			ne
		прѣняла						neprav			ne
		прѣняла					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣняло					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣняло						neprav			ne
		прѣняло						ne rek			ne
		прѣняли					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣняли						neprav			ne
		прѣнят					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣнят						neprav			ne
		прѣнята						ne rek			ne
		прѣнята						neprav			ne
		прѣнята					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣнято					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣнято						neprav			ne
		прѣняты					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣняты						neprav			ne
		прѣняты						neprav			ne
1038	'understand'	пѣнял	20	11	9	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пѣнял						g neprav			ne
		х	1								
1039		пѣняла						neprav			ne
		пѣняла						g neprav			ne
		пѣняла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1040		пoнaялo	12	5	7	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пoнaялo						g neprav			ne
		пoнaялo	9	6	3	43%					
1041		пoнaяли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пoнaяли						g neprav			ne
1042		пoнaят	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пoнaят						g neprav			ne
		x	1								
1043		пoнaятa	18	9	9	90%		ne rek			ne
		пoнaятa						g neprav			ne
		пoнaятá	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
1044		пoнaятo	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пoнaтo						g neprav			ne
		x	1								
1045		пoнaяты	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пoнaты						g neprav			ne
1054	'penetrate; get at'	пpoнaял	8	4	4	40%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пpoнaял	12	7	5	60%		neprav			ne
		x	1								
1055		пpoнaялa						neprav			ne
		пpoнaялa						neprav			ne
		пpoнaялá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1056		пpoнaялo	3	0	3	14%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пpoнaялo	1	1	0	5%		neprav			ne
		пpoнaялo	17	10	7	81%		ne rek			ne
1057		пpoнaяли	8	1	7	38%	✓	✓	✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		проня́ли	9	8	1	43%		neprav			ne
		проня́ли	4	2	2	19%					
1058		проня́т	17	8	9	81%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		проня́т	4	3	1	19%		neprav			ne
1059		проня́та	6	1	5	29%		ne rek			ne
		проня́та	3	3	0	14%		neprav			ne
		проня́та	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1060		проня́то	19	9	10	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		проня́то	1	1	0	5%		neprav			ne
		х	1								
1061		проня́ты	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		проня́ты	3	3	0	14%		neprav			ne
1046	'take off; take down'	сня́л	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1047		сня́ла						neprav			ne
		сня́ла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1048		сня́ло	6	3	3	29%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		сня́ло	15	8	7	71%		ne rek		✓(4)	ne
1049	(kak rukoi ... ) 'in a trice'	сня́ло							✓		✓
		сня́ли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1050		сня́т	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1051		сня́та	6	4	2	29%		ne rek			ne
		сня́та	15	7	8	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1052		сня́то	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сня́то						neprav			
1053		сня́ты	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сня́ты						neprav			



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1062	'calm; smooth; suppress'	у́нял	2	0	2	10%		✓			
		у́нял	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1063		у́нял	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		у́нял	18	10	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1064		у́няло	2	1	1	10%					
		у́няло	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		у́няло	9	5	4	43%		ne rek			ne
1065		у́няли	2	0	2	10%					
		у́няли	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1066		у́нят	7	2	5	33%					
		у́нят	14	9	5	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1067		у́нята	3	0	3	15%					
		у́нята	11	8	3	55%		ne rek			ne
		у́нята	6	3	3	30%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1068		у́нято	11	4	7	55%					
		у́нято	9	7	2	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1069		у́няты	7	1	6	33%					
		у́няты	14	10	4	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-клясть									
		клял					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'curse'	кляла					neprav				ne
1070		кляла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1071		кля́ло	6	4	2	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кляло́	15	7	8	71%		ne rek			ne
1072		кля́ли	16	7	9	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		кляли́	5	4	1	24%					ne
1073	'damn'	про́клял	19	10	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́л	1	1	0	5%		neprav		ne	ne
		х	1								
1074		про́кляла	5	3	2	24%		neprav		ne	ne
		прокля́ла						neprav		ne	ne
		прокля́ла́	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1075		про́кляло	16	6	10	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́ло						neprav		ne	ne
		прокля́ло́	5	5	0	24%		ne rek		ne	ne
1076		про́кляли	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́ли	3	1	2	14%		neprav		ne	ne
		прокля́ли́								ne	ne
1077		про́клят	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́т						neprav		ne	ne
	(-)	про́клята						ne rek	✓	ne	ne
	(-)	прокля́та						neprav	✓	ne	ne
	(-)	прокля́та́					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1078	(bud' ty/ona ... !)	про́клята	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓			✓
	(bud' ty/ona ... !)	прокля́та	1	1	0	5%					
1079		про́клято	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́то						neprav		ne	ne
1080		про́кляты	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прокля́ты						neprav		ne	ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		<b>-прясть</b>									
	'spin'	прѣл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1081		прѣла	12	6	6	57%		dop	✓	✓	dop
		прѣлѣ	9	5	4	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1082		прѣло	16	9	7	80%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣлѣ	4	1	3	20%					
		х	1								
1083		прѣли	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прѣлѣ	1	0	1	5%					
1084	'spin off'	отпрѣл	1	1	0	5%					
		отпрѣл	19	9	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1085		отпрѣла	20	11	9	95%		dop	✓	✓	dop
		отпрѣлѣ	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1086		отпрѣло	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		отпрѣлѣ	1	0	1	5%					
1087		отпрѣли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1088		отпрѣден	19	10	9	95%		✓	✓	✓	ne
		отпрѣдѣн	1	1	0	5%					
		отпрѣдѣн					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1089		отпрѣдена	20	11	9	100%		✓	✓	✓	ne
		отпрѣдена					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1090		отпрѣдено	18	9	9	90%		✓	✓	✓	ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		отпряденó	2	2	0	10 %	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
1091		отпря́дены	20	11	9	100 %	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
		отпря́дены					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		<b>-ВИТЬ</b>									
	'twist; wind'	Вѣл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1092		Вѣла	3	3	0	14%		neprav			ne
		Вѣла̃	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1093		Вѣло	13	7	6	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		Вѣло́	8	4	4	38%					
1094		Вѣли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1095	'wind around'	обвѣл	5	3	2	24%					dop
		обвѣл̃	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
1096		обвѣла									ne
		обвѣла̃	3	2	1	14%		neprav			ne
		обвѣла̃	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1097		обвѣло	2	0	2	10%					dop
		обвѣло̃	9	5	4	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обвѣло́	10	6	4	48%					
1098		обвѣли	3.5	2.5	1	17%					dop
		обвѣли̃	17.5	8.5	9	83%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1099		обвѣт	5	3	2	24%					dop
		обвѣт̃	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1100		обвѣта	4	0	4	19%					ne
		обвѣта̃	11	7	4	52%		dop	ne rek		razg
		обвѣта̃	6	4	2	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1101		обвѣто	1	0	1	5%					dop
		обвѣто̃	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обвѣто́	1	1	0	5%					
1102		обвѣты	5	4	1	25%					dop

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		объиты	15	6	9	75%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обвиты						neprav			
		x	1								
1103	'develop'	развил	21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav	✓	(2)	ne
1104		развила						neprav			ne
		развила	6	6	0	29%		neprav			ne
		развила	15	5	10	71%	✓		✓		✓
1105		развило	0.5	0	0.5	2%		neprav			ne
		развило	15.5	8	7.5	74%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		развило	5	3	2	24%					
1106		развили						neprav			ne
		развили	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1107	pppS 'developed'	развит	13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		развит	8	5	3	38%		✓	✓		✓
1108		развита	11	5	6	52%		ne rek			ne
		развита	3	2	1	14%		ne rek			ne
		развита	7	4	3	33%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1109		развито	14	6	8	67%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		развито	6.5	5	1.5	31%		✓	✓		✓
		развито	0.5	0	0.5	2%					
1110		развиты	14.5	7	7.5	69%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		развиты	6	4	2	29%		✓	✓		✓
		развиты	0.5	0	0.5	2%		neprav			
1111	'twist, curl, wave'	завил	2	1	1	10%					ne
		завил	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. √ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1112		завила		3	2	24%		neprav			ne
		завила	5								ne
		завилá	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1113		завило									ne
		завило	14	7	7	70%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		завилó	6	3	3	30%					
		х	1								
1114		завили	3	2	1	14%					ne
		завили	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1115		завит	7	1	6	33%	✓	✓			✓
		завит	14	10	4	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1116		завита	3	0	3	14%		ne rek			ne
		завита	7	5	2	33%		ne rek	ne rek		ne
		завитá	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1117		завито	11	3	8	52%	✓	✓			✓
		завито	10	8	2	48%		✓	✓	✓	✓
1118		завиты	8.5	3	5.5	40%	✓	✓			✓
		завиты	8.5	6	2.5	40%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		завиты́	4	2	2	19%		neprav			
		- ЖИТЬ									
	'live'	жил					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1119		жи́ла						neprav			ne
		жилá	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1120		жи́ло	8	5	3	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		жилó	12	6	6	60%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1121		жіли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1122	'live through'	про́жил	16	9	7	76%	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓	✓
1123		про́жил	5	2	3	24%	dop	dop			razg
		про́жила	2	1	1	10%	neprav	neprav			ne
		про́жила	1	0	1	5%	neprav	neprav			ne
		про́жила́	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1124		про́жило	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́жило	4	3	1	19%	dop	dop			razg
		про́жило́	7	3	4	33%	ne rek	ne rek			ne
1125		про́жило	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́жили	10	5	5	48%	dop	dop			razg
1126		про́жит	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1127		про́жит	1	1	0	5%	dop	dop			dop
		про́жита	15	8	7	71%	ne rek	ne rek			ne
		про́жита	4	2	2	19%	ne rek	ne rek			ne
		про́жита́	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1128		про́жито	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́жито	4	2	2	19%	dop	dop			dop
1129		про́житы	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́житы	3	1	2	14%	dop	dop			dop
1130	'heal; close up'	за́жил	11.5	6	5.5	55%	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓	✓
		за́жил	9.5	5	4.5	45%	dop	dop			razg
1131		за́жила					neprav	neprav			ne
		за́жила					neprav	neprav			ne
		за́жила́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1132		за́жило	10.5	7	3.5	50%	✓	✓	✓(5)	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		зажи́ло	1	0	1	5%		dop	✓		razg
		зажи́ло́	9.5	4	5.5	45%		ne rek			ne
1133		за́жили	12	5	7	57%	✓	✓	✓(5)	✓	✓
		зажи́ли	9	6	3	43%		dop	✓		razg
1134	'come to life, revive'	о́жил	17	7	10	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		о́жи́л	4	4	0	19%		ne rek			razg
1135		о́жила						neprav			ne
		о́жи́ла						neprav			ne
		о́жила́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1136		о́жило	9	3	6	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		о́жи́ло	2	1	1	10%		ne rek			razg
		о́жи́ло́	10	7	3	48%		ne rek			ne
1137		о́жили	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		о́жи́ли	4	2	2	19%		ne rek			razg
1138	'experience'	пе́режил	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
		пе́режи́л						neprav			ne
		пе́режи́л	18	9	9	86%		✓	✓		dop
		пе́режи́ла						neprav			ne
		пе́режи́ла						neprav			ne
		пе́режи́ла						neprav			ne
1139		пе́режи́ла́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1140		пе́режи́ло	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пе́режи́ло						neprav			ne
		пе́режи́ло	6	2	4	29%		✓	✓		dop
		пе́режи́ло́	12	7	5	57%		ne rek			ne
1141		пе́режи́ли	8	5	3	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пе́режи́ли						neprav			ne



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		пережіли	13	6	7	62%		✓	✓		✓
1142		пéрежит	5	2	3	24%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéжит						neprav			ne
		перéжіт	16	9	7	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1143		пéрежита	4.5	2	2.5	21%		ne rek			ne
		перéжита						neprav			ne
		перéжіта	3.5	1	2.5	17%		ne rek			ne
		перéжіта́	13	8	5	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1144		пéрежито	10	5	5	48%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéжито						neprav			ne
		перéжито	9	6	3	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		перéжито́	2	0	2	10%					
1145		пéрежиты	14	8	6	67%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		перéжиты						neprav			ne
		перéжіты	7	3	4	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		-ЛІТЬ									
		ліл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1146	'pour; spill'	лі́ла	1	1	0	5%		neprav			ne
		ли́ла	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1147		лі́ло	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ли́ло	20	11	9	95%		ne rek			ne
1148		лі́ли	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1157	'spill; shed'	про́лил	11	5	6	52%		✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
		про́ліл	10	6	4	48%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1158		про́лила						neprav			ne
		про́лила	3	2	1	14%		neprav			ne
		про́лила	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1159		про́лило	5	2	3	24%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́лило	7	4	3	33%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
		про́лило	9	5	4	43%		ne rek			ne
1160		про́лили	9	3	6	43%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́лили	12	8	4	57%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
1161		про́лит									
		про́лит	17	7	10	81%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́лит	4	4	0	19%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
1162		про́лита	8.5	4	4.5	40%		ne rek			ne
		про́лита	2	1	1	10%		ne rek			ne
		про́лита	10.5	6	4.5	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1163		про́лило	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́лило	4	3	1	19%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
1164		про́лилы	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		про́лилы					✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
		про́лилы						neprav			
1149	'pour out: cast'	о́тлил	3.5	2	1.5	17%		✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
		о́тлил	17.5	9	8.5	83%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1150		о́тлила						neprav			ne
		о́тлила	2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
		о́тлила	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1151		о́тлило	2	2	0	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		о́тлило	9	3	6	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		о́тлило	9	5	4	45%		ne rek			ne
		х	1								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1152		отли́ли отли́ли	2 19	1 10	1 9	10% 90%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop
1153		отли́т отли́т	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%		✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop
1154		отли́та отли́та	5 14	2 8	3 6	24% 67%		ne rek ne rek	ne rek ne rek		ne ne
1155		отли́та отли́то	2 3.5 17.5	1 1 10	1 2.5 7.5	10% 17% 83%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ dop
1156		отли́ты отли́ты	4 17	2 9	2 8	19% 81%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop
		отли́ты						neprav			
1165	'decant'	перели́л перели́ла	21 3	11 2	10 1	100% 14%	✓ ✓	✓ neprav	✓ ✓	(2) ✓	✓ ne
1166		перели́ла перели́ло	18 15	9 8	9 7	86% 71%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
1167		перели́ло перели́ло	6 21	3 11	3 10	29% 100%	✓ ✓	ne rek ✓	✓ ✓	ne ✓	ne ✓
1168		перели́ли перели́т	2 19	1 10	1 9	10% 90%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
1169		перели́т перели́та	2 16	0 8	2 8	10% 76%					ne
1170		перели́та перели́та	3 5	3 2	0 3	14% 24%	✓ ✓	ne rek ✓	ne rek ✓	ne ✓	ne ✓
1171		перели́то перели́то	16 3	9 1	7 2	76% 14%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
1172		перели́ты перели́ты	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		перелиты						neprav			
		-пить									
	'drink'	пѣл					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1173		пѣла						neprav			ne
		пѣлѧ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1174		пѣло	9	6	3	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пѣлѧ	12	5	7	57%					
1175		пѣли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1176	'drink up'	дѧпил	6	3	3	29%		✓	✓		✓
		дѧпѣл	15	8	7	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	dop
1177		дѧпила						neprav			ne
		дѧпѣла	2	2	0	10%		neprav			ne
		дѧпила	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		дѧпила	7	3	4	33%		✓	✓		✓
1178		дѧпило	13	8	5	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		дѧпило	1	0	1	5%		ne rek			
		дѧпило	4.5	1	3.5	21%		✓	✓		✓
1179		дѧпили	16.5	10	6.5	79%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		дѧпили									
1180		дѧпит	9	3	6	43%		✓	✓		✓
		дѧпѣт	12	8	4	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1181		дѧпита	6	1	5	29%		ne rek			ne
		дѧпѣта	10.5	7	3.5	50%		✓	ne rek	✓	razg
		дѧпѣта	4.5	3	1.5	21%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1182		дѧпитѧ	12	7	5	57%		✓	✓		✓
		дѧпитѧ	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1183		допиты	10	6	4	50%		✓	✓		✓
		допиты	10	5	5	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		х	1								
1184	'squander on drink'	пропил	11	5	6	52%		✓	✓		✓
		пропил	10	6	4	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	dop
1185		пропила						neprav			ne
		пропила	3	3	0	14%		neprav			ne
		пропила	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1186		пропило	7	3	4	35%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пропило	9	5	4	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		пропило	4	2	2	20%					
		х	1								
1187		пропили	14	7	7	67%		✓	✓		✓
		пропили	7	4	3	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1188		пропит	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пропит	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1189		пропита	11	7	4	55%		ne rek			ne
		пропита	6	2	4	30%	✓	✓	ne rek	✓	razg
		пропита	3	1	2	15%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1								
1190		пропито	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пропито	5	3	2	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1191		пропиты	14	8	6	67%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пропиты	7	3	4	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1192	'wash down'	запил	3.5	2	1.5	17%					
		запил	17.5	9	8.5	83%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1193		запіла	4	4	0	19%		неправ			ne
		запіла́	17	7	10	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1194		запи́ло	5	2	3	25%					
		запи́ло	10	5	5	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		запи́ло	5	4	1	25%					
		х	1								
1195		запи́ли									
		запи́ли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1196		за́пит	11	5	6	52%					
		за́пи́т	10	6	4	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1197		за́пита	5	3	2	24%					
		за́пита	14	7	7	67%	✓	✓	ne rek	✓	✓
		за́пита́	2	1	1	10%		✓	✓	✓	dop
1198		за́пито	10	3	7	48%					
		за́пи́то	11	8	3	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1199		за́питы	7.5	3	4.5	36%					
		за́пи́ты	13.5	8	5.5	64%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1200	'take to drink'	за́пил	17.5	8.5	9	83%	✓	✓	✓	(2)	✓
		за́пи́л	3.5	2.5	1	17%			✓		
1201		за́пи́ла	1	1	0	5%		неправ			ne
		за́пи́ла	1	1	0	5%					
		запи́ла́	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1202		запи́ло	10	6	4	50%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		запи́ло	4	2	2	20%			✓		
		запи́ло	6	3	3	30%					
		х	1								
1203		за́пи́ли	15.5	9	6.5	74%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		запи́ли	5.5	2	3.5	26%			✓		
1204	'take a drink'	попи́л	3	2	1	14%		✓	✓		✓
		попи́л	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	dop
1205		попи́ла						neprav			ne
		попи́ла	2	2	0	10%		neprav			ne
		попи́ла	18	8	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1								
1206		попи́ло	4	2	2	20%		✓	✓		✓
		попи́ло	12	6	6	60%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		попи́ло	4	3	1	20%					
		x	1								
1207		попи́ли	4	2	2	19%		✓	✓		✓
		попи́ли	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
1208		попи́т	8	4	4	42%		✓	✓		
		попи́т	11	7	4	58%		✓	✓	✓	
		x	2								
1209		попи́та	6	2	4	33%					
		попи́та	12	8	4	67%		✓	ne rek	✓	
		попи́та						✓	✓	✓	
		x	3								
1210		попи́то	11	6	5	58%		✓	✓		✓
		попи́то	8	5	3	42%		✓	✓	✓	
		x	2								
1211		попи́ты	7	3	4	39%		✓	✓		
		попи́ты	11	8	3	61%		✓	✓	✓	
		x	3								

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		<b>-ТНИТЬ</b>									
	'decompose (intransitive)'	тніл					✓	✓	✓		✓
1212		тніла	2	2	0	10%		neprav			ne
		тніла́	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1213		тніло	14	7	7	67%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		тніло́	7	4	3	33%		ne rek			ne
1214		тніли	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		тніли́	1	1	0	5%					
1215	'rot through'	про́тніл	1	0	1	5%					
		про́тніл	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1216		про́тніла	8.5	4.5	4	40%		neprav			ne
		про́тніла́	12.5	6.5	6	60%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1217		про́тніло	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		про́тніло́	3	1	2	14%		ne rek			ne
1218		про́тніли	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		про́тніли́	1	1	0	5%					
		<b>родить</b>									
	'give birth to' (perf)	роді́л					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1219		роді́ла						neprav			ne
		роді́ла́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1220		роді́ло	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		роді́ло́	17	8	9	81%		ne rek			ne
1221		роді́ли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		роді́ли́									ne
1222	'give birth to' (imperf)	роді́ла	9	4	5	45%	✓	✓	✓	(2)	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. √ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		родилá	11	7	4	55%					
		х	1								
		-бить									
1223	'make a hole through'	прóбил пробíл	5.5 15.5	3 8	2.5 7.5	26% 74%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1224		прóбила пробíла	2 19	0 11	2 8	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		пробíлá									
		х	1								
1225		прóбило пробíло	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1226		прóбили пробíли	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1227	'strike (a time/an hour)'	прóбил пробíл	16 5	7 4	9 1	76% 24%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1228		прóбила пробíла	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%		✓	✓		✓
		пробíлá									
1229		прóбило пробíло	11 10	5 6	6 4	52% 48%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1230		прóбили пробíли	11 10	5 6	6 4	52% 48%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		-быть									
1231	'get; attain'	дóбыл	3	1	2	14%		dop ust	✓		dop

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1232		добыл	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		добыла									ne
		добыла	16	9	7	76%		ne rek			ne
		добыла	5	2	3	24%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1233		добыло	2	1	1	10%		dop ust	✓		dop
		добыло	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		добыло	1	0	1	5%					
1234		добыли	2	1	1	10%		dop ust	✓		dop
		добыли	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1235		добыт	4	2	2	19%		dop	✓		dop
		добыт	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1236		добыта	1	1	0	5%					ne
		добыта	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		добыта	1	1	0	5%					
1237		добыто	3	1	2	14%		✓	✓		dop
		добыто	18	10	8	86%	✓	dop	✓		✓
1238		добыты						✓	✓		dop
		добыты	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop	✓		✓
1239	'subside; go away'	убыл	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		убыл	2	0	2	10%		neprav			
1240		убыла	8	6	2	38%		neprav			ne
		убыла						neprav			ne
		убыла	13	5	8	62%	✓	✓	✓		✓
1241		убыло	17	9	8	85%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		убыло	1	0	1	5%		neprav			
		убыло	2	1	1	10%					
		x	1								





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1251	'swim; float'	плыл плыла плыла плыло плыло плыли плыли					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1252			21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav	✓	✓	ne
1253			8	3	5	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1254			13	8	5	62%		ne rek			ne
1255			21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1256								neprav			ne
1257											
1258											
1259											
1260											
1261											
1251	'swim to'	приплыл приплыла приплыла приплыло приплыло приплыло приплыло приплыли приплыли	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓
1252			1	1	0	5%		neprav			ne
1253			20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1254			1	1	0	5%					
1255			13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1256			7	4	3	33%		ne rek			ne
1257			21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1258											ne
1259											
1260											
1261											
1251	'have the reputation of'	-слыть слыл слыла слыла слыло слыло слыло слыли слыли					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1252			2	1	1	10%		neprav			ne
1253			19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1254			13	8	5	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1255			8	3	5	38%		ne rek			ne
1256			21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1257											ne
1258											
1259											
1260											
1261											
1251	'die'	-мереть умер	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓(1)	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1262		ўмерла ўмерла ўмерло ўмерло ўмерли ўмерлі	21 20 1 21	11 10 1 11	10 10 0 10	100% 95% 5% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	neprav ✓ ✓ ne rek ✓ neprav	✓ ✓  ✓	✓ ✓  ✓	ne ✓ ✓ ne ✓ ne
1265	'become rooted to the spot'	замер замерла замерла замерло замерло замерли замерлі	21 2 19 18 3 21	11 0 11 10 1 11	10 2 8 8 2 10	100% 10% 90% 86% 14% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ neprav ✓ ✓ ne rek ✓	✓  ✓ ✓  ✓	✓(1)  ✓ ✓  ✓	✓ ne ✓ ✓ ne ✓ ne
1269	'die out'	пéремер перемёр перемёр х перемёрла перемёрла перемёрла х пéремерло перемёрло перемёрло перемёрло х пéремерли	19 1 1 13 1 6 1 18 1 1 1	9 1 1 6 1 3  8	10 0 0 7 0 3  10	95% 5%  65% 5% 30%  90% 5% 5%	✓   ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ dop  ne rek ✓ ✓ dop	✓    ✓ ✓  ✓ ✓	✓(1)    ✓ ✓  ✓ ✓	✓ razg  razg ✓ ✓ razg  ✓
1270		перемёрла перемёрла перемёрла х пéремерло перемёрло перемёрло перемёрло х пéремерли	13 1 6 1 18 1 1 1	6 1 3  8 1 1 1	7 0 3  10 0 0 0	65% 5% 30%  90% 5% 5%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	ne rek ✓ ✓ ✓ dop	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	razg ✓ ✓ ✓ razg ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
1271		перемёрло перемёрло перемёрло перемёрло х пéремерли	18 1 1 1 1	8 1 1 1  1	10 0 0 0  1	90% 5% 5%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	razg ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
1272		пéремерли	1	1	0	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		перемёрли перемёрли перемёрли	17 3 1	8 2 1	9 1 0	81% 14% 5%		dop			razg
		-переть									
1273	'lock'	запер	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1274		заперла заперла заперло	6.5 14.5 19	2 9 10	4.5 5.5 9	31% 69% 90%	✓ ✓ ✓	neprav ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	ne ✓ ✓
1275		заперло	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1276		заперло заперли заперли	2 21 21	1 11 11	1 10 10	10% 100% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓	neprav ✓ neprav	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	ne ✓ ne
1277		заперт	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1278		заперта заперта заперто	15 6 21	8 3 11	7 3 10	71% 29% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓	neprav ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	ne ✓ ✓
1279		заперто	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1280		заперты	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1281	'lean against'	опер опёр оперла	7 14 1	3 8 0	4 6 1	33% 67% 5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
1282		оперла опёрла оперла	8 12 5	6 5 2	2 7 3	38% 57% 24%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	dop ✓ ✓
1283		оперло опёрло оперло	2 12 2	1 7 7	1 5 5	10% 57% 10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		оперло	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		оперло	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
1284		оперли	7	5	2	33%					
		опёрли	2	1	1	10%					
		опёрли	11	4	7	52%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		оперлі	1	1	0	5%	✓				
1285		оперт	8	3	5	38%					
		опёрт	13	8	5	62%		✓	✓	✓	✓
1286		оперта	3	2	1	14%					
		опёрта	16	7	9	76%		✓	✓	✓	dop
		оперта́	2	2	0	10%		✓	✓		✓
1287		оперто	10	5	5	48%					
		опёрто	10	5	5	48%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		опертó	1	1	0	5%					
1288		оперты	4	2	2	19%					
		опёрты	14	6	8	67%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		опёрты	1	1	0	5%					
		оперты́	2	2	0	10%					
1289	'prop up'	подпер	8	5	3	38%					
		подпёр	13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
1290		подпёрла	12.5	6	6.5	60%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		подпёрла́	8.5	5	3.5	40%		ne rek			ne
1291		подперло	3	1	2	14%					
		подпёрло	1	1	0	5%					
		подпёрло	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		подперло́	1	1	0	5%					
1292		подперли	5	3	2	24%					
		подпёрли	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓	(21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959	
	c) ii) Reflexive verbs: past											
		-да́ться										
1297	'let oneself be caught'	да́лся да́лся да́лась да́лась да́лось да́лось да́лись да́лись	19 2 21 21 1 20	11 0 11 11 1 10	8 2 10 10 0 10	90% 10% 100% 100% 5% 95%	✓  ✓  ✓ ✓	dop ustar  dop dop dop dop	✓  ustar ne ✓ razg ✓ razg ✓			
1298												
1299												
1300												
1301	'resound, be heard'	разда́лся разда́лся разда́лась разда́лась разда́лось разда́лось разда́лись разда́лись	20 1 1 20 2 19 4 17	11 0 1 10 1 10 3 8	9 1 0 10 1 9 1 9	95% 5% 5% 95% 10% 90% 19% 81%	✓  ✓ dop dop dop dop dop	ustar ne ustar ne ustar ne ustar ustar	✓  ustar ne ustar ne ustar ustar			
1302												
1303												
1304												
1305	'yield, give in'	по́дда́лся по́дда́лся по́дда́лся по́дда́лась по́дда́лась по́дда́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav ustar dop neprav neprav	ustar ustar ustar ustar ustar ustar	ustar ustar ustar ustar ustar ustar		
1306												

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1307		по́дда́лось						neprav		
		по́дда́лось						dop	✓	razg
		по́дда́лось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1308		по́дда́лись						neprav		
		по́дда́лись	4	3	1	20%		dop	✓	razg
		по́дда́лись	16	8	8	80%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1							
1309	'be transmitted; be communicated'	пе́реда́лся						neprav		
		пе́реда́лся						neprav		
		пе́реда́лся	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пе́реда́лся	1	0	1	5%		dop ustar		ustar
1310		пе́реда́лась						neprav		
		пе́реда́лась						neprav		
		пе́реда́лась						neprav		ne
		пе́реда́лась	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1							
1311		пе́реда́лось						neprav		
		пе́реда́лось						neprav		
		пе́реда́лось						dop	✓	razg
		пе́реда́лось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1312		пе́реда́лись						neprav		
		пе́реда́лись						neprav		
		пе́реда́лись	4	2	2	21%		dop	✓	razg
		пе́реда́лись	15	9	6	79%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	2							
		созда́ться								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1313	'be founded'	созда́лся						neprav		ne
		созда́лся	19	11	8	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		созда́лся	1	0	1	5%		dop ustar		ustar
		х	1							
1314		созда́лась						neprav		ne
		созда́лась						neprav		ne
		созда́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1315		созда́лось	1	0	1	5%		neprav		ne
		созда́лось						dop	✓	razg
		созда́лось	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1316		созда́лись	2	2	0	10%		neprav		ne
		созда́лись	4	2	2	19%		dop	✓	razg
		созда́лись	15	7	8	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		зваться								
1317	'be called'	зв́а́лся	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		зв́а́лся	1	1	0	5%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
1318		зв́а́лась						neprav		ne
		зв́а́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1319		зв́а́лось	1	1	0	5%		dop	✓	dop
		зв́а́лось	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1320		зв́а́лись	4	2	2	19%		dop	✓	dop
		зв́а́лись	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-в́ра́ться								
1321	'become entangled in lies'	зав́ра́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		зав́ра́лся						dop ustar	ustar	ustar

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1322		завра́лась	2	1	1	10%		neprav		ne
		завра́лась	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1323		завра́лось	2	1	1	10%		dop	✓	dop
		завра́лось	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1324		завра́лись	5	4	1	24%		dop	✓	dop
		завра́лись	16	7	9	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-жра́ться								
1325	'stuff oneself'	обо́жра́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		обо́жра́лся					dop	ustar	ustar	ustar
1326		обо́жра́лась	4	1	3	19%		neprav	✓	ne
		обо́жра́лась	17	10	7	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1327		обо́жра́лось	4	1	3	19%		dop	✓	dop
		обо́жра́лось	17	10	7	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1328		обо́жра́лись	6	1	5	29%		dop	✓	dop
		обо́жра́лись	15	10	5	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-лгáться								
1329	'become an inveterate liar'	изо́лгáлся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		изо́лгáлся						ustar	ustar	
1330		изо́лгáлась	3.5	1	2.5	17%		neprav		ne
		изо́лгáлась	17.5	10	7.5	83%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1331		изо́лгáлось	10	3	7	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		изо́лгáлось	11	8	3	52%	✓	✓	✓	dop
1332		изо́лгáлись	11	3	8	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		изо́лгáлись	10	8	2	48%	✓	✓	✓	dop



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
		<b>-рваться</b>								
1333	'break; tear; explode'	рва́лся	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		рва́лся	1	0	1	5%	dop ustar	ustar	ustar	ustar
1334		рва́лась					neprav			ne
		рва́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1335		рва́лось					dop	✓	✓	dop
		рва́лось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1336		рва́лись	1	1	0	5%	dop	✓	✓	dop
		рва́лись	19	9	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1							
1337	'break open; burst open'	прорва́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прорва́лся					dop ustar	ustar	ustar	ustar
1338		прорва́лась	1	0	1	5%	ne rek			ne
		прорва́лась	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1339		прорва́лось					dop	✓	✓	dop
		прорва́лось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1340		прорва́лись	4	2	2	19%	dop	✓	✓	dop
		прорва́лись	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		<b>ткаться</b>								
1341	'be woven'	тка́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓			✓
1342		тка́лась	3	1	2	14%	dop			dop
		тка́лась	18	10	8	86%	✓			✓
1343		тка́лось	6	3	3	29%	dop			dop
		тка́лось	15	8	7	71%	✓			✓
1344		тка́лись	10	6	4	48%	dop			dop

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
		ткалісь	11	5	6	52%	✓	✓		✓
		<b>братсья</b>								
1345	'be taken'	брáлся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	ustar	✓
1346		брался						dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		брáлась						neprav		ne
		бралась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1347		брáлось	1	0	1	5%		dop	✓	dop
		брало́сь	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1348		брáлись	6	3	3	29%		dop	✓	dop
		брали́сь	15	8	7	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		<b>драться</b>								
1349	'fight'	дрáлся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	ustar	✓
1350		дрался						dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		дрáлась	1	0	1	5%		neprav		ne
		дралась	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1351		дрáлось	1	0	1	5%		dop	✓	dop
		драло́сь	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1352		дрáлись	2	2	0	10%		dop	✓	dop
		драли́сь	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		<b>гнаться</b>								
1353	'chase about after'	гна́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	ustar	✓
		гнался						dop ustar	ustar	ustar
1354		гна́лась						neprav		ne



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (/10)	SU % total	1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1355		пнaлaсь	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пнaлocь	1	0	1	5%	dop	✓	dop	✓
1356		пнaлaсь	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пнaлocь	5	2	3	24%	dop	✓	dop	✓
		пнaлocь	16	9	7	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		- ждaтьcя								
1357	'wait for and meet'	ждaлaсь	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1358		ждaлocь	3	1	2	14%	dop ustar	ustar	ustar	ustar
		ждaлaсь	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1359		ждaлocь	3	0	3	14%	dop	✓	dop	dop
1360		ждaлocь	18	11	7	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ждaлocь	8.5	5.5	3	40%	dop	✓	dop	dop
		ждaлocь	12.5	5.5	7	60%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-cпaтьcя								
1361	'sleep' (+ D personal pronoun)	cпaлocь	21	11	10	100%	✓	ne rek	✓	dop
		cпaлocь						✓	✓	✓
1362	'sober up after a sleep'	пpocпaлcя	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1363		пpocпaлcя	3	2	1	14%			ustar	ne
		пpocпaлaсь	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1364		пpocпaлocь	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пpocпaлocь	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	dop
1365		пpocпaлocь	8	4	4	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
		проспались	13	7	6	62%		✓	✓	dop
1366	'be sink into a deep sleep'	разоспáлся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		разоспáлся́							ustar	
1367		разоспáлась	5	2	3	25%				ne
		разоспáлась	15	8	7	75%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1							
1368		разоспáлось	2	0	2	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		разоспáлось	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	dop
1369		разоспáлись	9	3	6	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		разоспáлись	12	8	4	57%	✓	✓	✓	dop
		начаться								
1370	'begin (intransitive)'	начáлся	14	7	7	67%		неправ		ne
		начáлся	3	3	0	14%		неправ		ne
		начáлся́	4	1	3	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1371		начáлась						неправ		ne
		начáлась						неправ		ne
		начáлась						✓	✓	✓
1372		начáлось	21	11	10	100%	✓	неправ		ne
		начáлось						неправ		ne
		начáлось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1373		начáлись						неправ		ne
		начáлись						неправ		ne
		начáлись	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		взяться								



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓	(21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1374	'appear from'	взя́лся	17.5	10	7.5	83%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		взя́лся	3.5	1	2.5	17%		dop ustar		✓	ustar
1375		взя́лась						neprav			ne
		взя́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓		✓	✓
1376		взя́лось	1	1	0	5%		dop			razg
		взя́лось	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓		✓	✓
1377		взя́лись	1	0	1	5%		dop			razg
		взя́лись	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓		✓	✓
		-ня́ться									
1378	'rise'	по́днялся	1	0	1	5%		neprav			ne
		по́днялся	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓		✓	✓
		по́днялся	1	0	1	5%		✓		✓	dop
1379		по́днялась						neprav			ne
		по́днялась						neprav			ne
		по́днялась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓		✓	✓
1380		по́днялось						neprav			ne
		по́днялось	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop		✓	ne
		по́днялось						✓		✓	✓
1381		по́днялось	21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav			ne
		по́днялись	1	1	0	5%		dop		✓	ne
		по́днялись	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓		✓	✓
1382	'begin (intransitive)'	при́нялся	9.5	5.5	4	45%		neprav			ne
		при́нялся	2.5	1.5	1	12%		dop		✓	razg
		при́нялся	9	4	5	43%	✓	✓		✓	✓
1383		при́нялась						neprav			ne
		при́нялась						neprav			ne

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1384		принялась принялось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		принялось						neprav		ne
		принялось						ne rek		ne
1385		принялось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		принялись	3	3	0	14%		neprav		ne
		принялись						ne rek		ne
		принялись	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1386	'calm down'	унылся	1	0	1	5%				
		унылся	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		унылся	2	1	1	10%		dop ustar		ustar
1387		унылась						neprav		ne
		унылась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1388		унылось	2	0	2	10%		dop	✓	razg
		унылось	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1389		унылись	4	2	2	19%		dop	✓	razg
		унылись	17	9	8	81%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-клясться								
1390	'swear, vow'	клялся	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		клялся	1	0	1	5%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
1391		клялась						neprav		ne
		клялась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1392		клялось						dop	✓	razg
		клялось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1393		клялись	1.5	1.5	0	7%		dop	✓	razg
		клялись	19.5	9.5	10	93%	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1394	'swear not to do something (low style)'	закля́лся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1395		закля́лся						ustar	ustar	
		закля́лась	2	1	1	10%		ne rek	ne	✓
		закля́лась	18	10	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		х	1							
1396		закля́лось	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	razg
		закля́лось	18	9	9	86%		✓	✓	✓
1397		закля́лись	3	2	1	15%	✓	✓	✓	razg
		закля́лись	17	9	8	85%		✓	✓	✓
		х	1							
		внѣсья								
1398	'wind; curl (of hair)'	внѣсья	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		внѣсья	2	0	2	10%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
1399		внѣсья	1	1	0	5%		neprav	ne	ne
		внѣсья	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1400		внѣсья	3	3	0	14%		dop	✓	razg
		внѣсья	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1401		внѣсья	3	3	0	14%		dop	✓	razg
		внѣсья	18	8	10	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-жнѣсья								
1402	'have some or other experience of life' + D personal pronoun	жнѣсья								
		жнѣсья	21	11	10	100%	✓	ne rek	✓	razg
1403	'settle down; become acclimatised'	прнѣсья	1	1	0	5%			✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
		прижілся	14	9	5	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1404		прижілся	6	1	5	29%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		прижілась	21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav	✓	ne
1405		прижілось	1	1	0	5%		dop	✓	razg
		прижілось	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1406		прижілись	2	2	0	10%		dop	✓	razg
		прижілись	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1407	'become rich'	нажілся	1	1	0	5%		neprav		ne
		нажілся	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1408		нажілся						dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		нажілась						neprav		ne
		нажілась	21	11	10	100%	✓	neprav	✓	ne
1409		нажілась						neprav		ne
		нажілось	1	1	0	5%		dop	✓	razg
		нажілось	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1410		нажілись						neprav		ne
		нажілись	2	1	1	10%		dop	✓	razg
		нажілись	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-лїться								
1411	'flow'	лїлся	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		лїлся	2	0	2	10%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
1412		лїлась						neprav		ne
		лїлась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1413		лїлось	2	2	0	10%		dop	✓	razg





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1423	'ruin oneself through excessive drink'	пропіляся	1	0	1	5%		neprav		ne
		пропіляся	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1424		пропіляся	1	0	1	5%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		пропілясь						neprav		ne
		пропілясь						neprav		ne
		пропілясь	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1425		пропілюсь						neprav		ne
		пропілюсь	2	2	0	10%		dop	✓	razg
		пропілюсь	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1426		пропілись	1	0	1	5%		neprav		ne
		пропілись	2	2	0	10%		dop	✓	razg
		пропілись	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		родиться								
1427	'be born' (perf)	роділся	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		родилсѧ						✓	✓	✓
1428		роділась						dop		dop
		роділась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1429		роділось	2	1	1	10%		dop	✓	dop
		роділось	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1430		роділись	2	1	1	10%		dop	✓	dop
		роділись	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1431	'have (eg an idea); be born' (impf)	роділся	18	11	7	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	3							
1432		роділась	7	6	1	39%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		роділась	11	5	6	61%				
		x	3							



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
1433		роділось	8	5	3	44%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		родилось	10	6	4	56%				
		x	3							
1434		роділись	12	7	5	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		родились	6	4	2	33%				
		x	3							
		-плыцца								
1435	'run (eg of ink)'	расплылся	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop	ustar	ustar
1436		расплылся						neprav		ne
		расплылась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1437		расплылось	1	1	0	5%		dop	✓	dop
		расплылось	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1438		расплылись	8	5	3	38%		dop	✓	dop
		расплылись	13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1439	'run together; merge; blend'	сплылся	19	11	8	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сплылся	1	0	1	5%		dop	ustar	ustar
		x	1							
1440		сплылась								ne
		сплылась	19	11	8	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	2							
1441		сплылось						dop	✓	dop
		сплылось	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1							
1442		сплылись						dop	✓	dop
		сплылись	20	10	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
		х	1							
		сбы́ться								
1443	'come true, be realized'	сбы́лся	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	ustar	✓
1444		сбы́лся́	1	0	1	5%		dop ustar	ustar	ustar
		сбы́лась						neprav		ne
1445		сбы́лась	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сбы́лось						ne rek	✓	razg
		сбы́лось	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1446		сбы́лись	2	2	0	10%		ne rek	✓	razg
		сбы́лись	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		-переться								
1447	'lock oneself in, be locked up' (1)	за́перся	20	11	9	95%		ne rek	✓	razg
		за́перся́	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1448		за́перлась						neprav		ne
		за́перлась	1	0	1	5%				
		за́перлась	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1449		за́перлось	7	5	2	33%		ne rek	✓	razg
		за́перлось	1	0	1	5%				
		за́перлось	13	6	7	62%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1450		за́перлись	14	9	5	67%		ne rek	✓	razg
		за́перлись	7	2	5	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓
1451	'lean on, be propped up on'	подпе́рся	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		подпе́рся́	1	1	0	5%		ne rek		ustar
1452		подпе́рлась	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓







No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Foug. 1974	A&O 1959
c) iii) pppL versus adjL										
814	'disdained'	pppL презренный презренный	21	11	10	100%	✓	maloupot	✓	
815	'despicable'	adjL презренный презренный	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
816	'cursed'	pppL проклятый проклятый	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
817	'accursed'	adjL проклятый проклятый	1.5 19.5	0 11	1.5 8.5	7% 93%	✓	✓	✓	✓
818	'wound'	pppL вита вита	18 3	10 1	8 2	86% 14%	✓	✓(1)	✓	✓
819	'spiral' (lestnitsa)	adjL вита вита	2 19	1 10	1 9	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
820	'with hair curled'	pppL завита завита завита	3 12 6	2 7 2	1 5 4	14% 57% 29%	✓	ne rek ✓ poet vozm	✓	ne ✓ ✓
821	'with curled hair'	adjL завита завита завита	2 6 13	1 4 6	1 2 7	10% 29% 62%	✓	ne rek ✓	✓	ne ✓
822	'filled with (liquid)'	pppL налита	11	5	6	52%	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Foug. 1974	A&O 1959
		нали́тая	9	6	3	43%	✓	dop	✓	dop
		нали́та́я	1	0	1	5%		poet vozm		
823	'ripe, juicy'	adjL нали́тая	6	5	1	29%				
		нали́та́я	15	6	9	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓
824	'squandered on drink'	pppL пропи́тая	11	4	7	52%	✓	✓	✓	dop
		пропи́та́я	9	7	2	43%		✓	✓	✓
		пропи́та́е	1	0	1	5%				
825	'drunkard's' (eg litso)	adjL пропи́тое	2	2	0	10%				
		пропи́то́е	7	5	2	33%				
		пропи́то́е	12	4	8	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'unravelled' (literal)	pppL разви́тая					✓	✓		
826	'developed'	pppL разви́тая	11	7	4	52%	✓	✓		ne(2)
		разви́та́я	7	4	3	33%		✓	✓(3)	✓(2)
		разви́та́я	3	0	3	14%				✓(2)
827	'developed'	adjL разви́тая	10.5	7	3.5	50%		ne rek		ne
		разви́та́я	1	1	0	5%				
		разви́та́я	9.5	3	6.5	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓
828	'taken down'	pppL сня́тая	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
829	'skimmed' (moloko)	adjL сня́тое	14	9	5	67%				
		сня́то́е	7	2	5	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Foug. 1974	A&O 1959
830	'finely ground'	pppL	7	4	3	44%	✓	✓(1)	✓	✓
			9	4	5	56%				
			5							
831	'finely ground' (muka)	adjL	6	3	3	33%			✓	✓
			12	5	7	67%	✓			
			3							
832	'earned'	pppL	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	✓
833	'of great merit'	adjL	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	dop
								dop ustar	razg	
	'deserved, well-earned'	adjL					✓	✓		
834	'salted;pickled' (ryba)	pppL	17	10	7	81%		✓	✓	
			4	1	3	19%				
835	'salted;pickled' (ryba)	adjL	16	8	8	76%	✓			✓(3,4)
			5	3	2	24%				
	'with a raised salt content'	adjL					✓	✓	✓(3)	
836	'folded'	pppL	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
837	'of a particular frame, build'	adjL	20	11	9	95%				
			1	0	1	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓
	'rare; thinned'	pppL						dop	✓	

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Foug. 1974	A&O 1959
		изрежённый						✓		
	'too sparse'	adjL изрэжённый изрежённый					✓(4)		✓	ne(4) ✓(4)
838	'humiliated'	pppL унижённый	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
839	'humble'	adjL униженную униженную	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop ustar	✓	✓
	'cut off'	pppL усеченный усечённый						✓	ustar ✓	
	'truncated'	adjL усеченный усечённый					✓(4)	✓	✓	ustar(4) ✓(4)
840	'lived in, occupied'	pppL обжитая обжитая обжитая	3 13 5	1 7 3	2 6 2	14% 62% 24%		✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	dop ✓
841	'lived in, occupied'	adjL обжитая обжитая обжитая	1 6.5 13.5	1 4 6	0 2.5 7.5	5% 31% 64%			✓(5) ✓(5)	✓
842	'occupied'	pppL занятое занятое	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
								neprav		ne
843	'busy'	adjL занятая занятая	6 15	3 8	3 7	29% 71%	✓	ne rek ✓	✓	ne ✓







No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
<b>c) iv) Present gerund</b>										
773	gerund	глядя глядя	20 1	11 0	9 1	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
774	quasi-prepositional phrase	глядя по	21	11	10	100%			✓	✓
775	gerund	лежа лежа	18 3	8 3	10 0	86% 14%		✓	✓	
776	adverb	лежа	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
777	gerund	молча молча	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%				✓
778	adverb	молча	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
779	gerund	не хотя не хотя х	1 19 1	1 10	0 9	5% 95%		✓ nes		
780	adverb	нехотя	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓
781	gerund	сидя	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	✓
782	adverb	сидя	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	✓
783	gerund	стоя	21	11	10	100%		✓		✓
784	adverb	стоя	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	% total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
785	gerund	судя	14	7	7	70%		✓		
		судя́	6	4	2	30%	✓	✓		✓
		х	1							
786	quasi-prepositional phrase	судя по	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓
		судя́ по	2	0	2	10%				
787	gerund	пóлулѣжа	21	11	10	100%				
788	adverb	пóлулѣжа	21	11	10	100%	✓		✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	AG 1980	Zal. 1977	A&O 1959
<b>d) Negative particles ne/ni + past, pppS</b>											
789		не был	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
790		не была́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
791		не было	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
792		не были	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
793		ни́ был	21	11	10	100%			✓	✓	
794		ни́ была́	21	11	10	100%			✓	✓	
795		ни́ было	20	11	9	100%			✓	✓	
796		х ни́ были	1 21	11	10	100%			✓	✓	
797		не́ дал	2.5	0	2.5	12%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		не да́л	18.5	11	7.5	88%		dop	dop		
798		не да́ла	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
799		не́ дало					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		не да́ло	4	2	2	20%		dop			
		не да́ло́	16	9	7	80%		dop	dop	✓	
		х	1								
800		не́ дали					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		не да́ли	21	11	10	100%		dop			
801		не́ дан	3.5	2	1.5	18%	✓		✓		
		не да́н	16.5	8	8.5	82%					
		х	1								
802		не да́на	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
803		не́ дано					✓	✓	✓	✓	
		не дано́	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓	✓	









No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
696	excessive 'too big'	велика́ велика́	21 21	11 11	10 10	100% 100%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
698	'(coll.) nimble, agile'	вѣртка вѣртка вертка́	1 4 16	1 3 7	0 1 9	5% 19% 76%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
699	'grown-up, adult'	взросла́ взросла́	2 19	1 10	1 9	10% 90%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
700	'visible'	видна́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
701	'distinguished, prominent'	ві́днa видна́	3 18	2 9	1 9	14% 86%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
702	'imperious, masterful'	вла́стна властна́	9 12	7 4	2 8	43% 57%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ dop
703	'boggy; sticky; viscous'	в'язка́ в'язка́	8 13	7 4	1 9	38% 62%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
704	'angry, irate'	гнѣвна́ гневна́	6 14	6 5	0 10	31% 69%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
705	'fast, tireless (in pursuit of prey)'	го́нка гонка́ х	8 10 3	6 4	2 6	44% 56%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
706	'spilt up, subdivided'	дро́бна дробна́	7 13	5 5	2 8	35% 65%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		х	1								
707	'flabby, flaccid'	дрябля дрябля́ х	9 11 1	7 4	2 7	45% 55%	√	√ √	√ √	√	√
708	'acid, caustic, pungent'	едка едка́	6 16	4 8	2 8	26% 74%	√	√	√ √		√
709	'cruel'	жесто́ка жестока́	21	11	10	100%	√	√ dop ustar	√ √	√	√
710	(dial.) 'chilly, sensitive to cold'	зно́бка знобка́ х	5 15 1	4 7	1 8	25% 75%	√	√ √	√ √		√
711	'sharp-sighted, vigilant'	зо́рка зорка́	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	√	√ √	√ √	√	√
712	'shaky, unsteady'	зы́бка зыбка́ х	7 13 1	7 4	0 9	35% 65%	√		√ √	√	
713	'sensitive to cold, chilly'	зя́бка зябка́	10 11	6 5	4 6	48% 52%	√	√ √	√ √		√
714	'easily rolled; slippery'	ка́тка катка́	6 15	6 5	0 10	29% 71%	√	√ √	√ √		



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
715	(dial./fig.) 'weak, poorly'	квѣла квѣла квелá	2 14 5	1 9 1	1 5 4	10% 67% 24%		✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓		✓
716	'sticky, (bumaga - fly-paper)'	клѣйка кле́йка х	10 10 1	8 3	2 7	50% 50%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
717	'malleable, ductile'	кóвка ковкá	8 13	5 6	3 7	38% 62%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
718	'easily split; biting, sharp'	кóлка колкá	11 10	7 4	4 6	52% 48%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
719	'closely grouped (of shots)'	кúчна кучнá	6 15	3 8	3 7	29% 71%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
	'left-hand, left-wing'	лѣва левá							✓zamd ✓zamd	✓	
720	'brittle, fragile'	лóмка ломкá	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
721	'populous, crowded'	лю́дна люднá	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓
722	'liable to stain (newly-painted)'	ма́зка мазкá х	2 16 3	2 8	0 8	11% 89%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
723	'easily soiled or marked'	мáрка маркá	8 13	6 5	2 8	38% 62%	√	√	√		√
724	'fashionable'	мóдна моднá х	4 16 1	3 7	2 8	22% 78%	√	√	√		√
725	'freely lathering'	мы́лка мылкá	14 7	9 2	5 5	67% 33%	√	√	√		√
726	'hard-wearing, durable'	но́ска носкá	10 12	6 5	4 6	45% 55%	√	√	√		√
727	(coll.) 'steamy, sultry'	па́рка паркá	7 14	6 5	1 9	33% 67%	√	√	√		
728	'fusible, melting'	пла́вка плавкá	11 10	8 3	3 7	52% 48%	√	√	√		√
729	'smooth-flowing; (ling.) liquid'	пла́вна плавнá х	6 14 1	5 6	1 8	30% 70%	√	√	√	√	√
730	'flat'	плóска плоскá	8 13	5 6	3 7	38% 62%	√	√	√	√	√
731	'accepted'	при́нята принáта	14	10	4	67%		ne rek неправ	√		ne √



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		приня́та	7	1	6	33%	√	√	√		√
732	adjS f 'elated, excited; elevated'	припо́днята	21	11	10	100%		√	√		ne
		приподня́та					√		√		ne
733	pppS f 'slightly raised'	припо́днята	18	9	9	86%		ne rek			√
		приподня́та	3	2	1	14%	√				
734	adjS f 'developed'	ра́звита	14	9	6	69%		ne rek	√		ne
		разви́та	6	2	4	31%	√		√		√
735	pppS f 'unwound, unravelled'	ра́звита	3	2	1	15%					ne
		разви́та	13	7	6	65%		dop			ne
		разви́та	4	2	2	20%	√	√			√
		x	1								
736	pppS f 'developed'	ра́звита	8	3	5	38%		ne rek			
		разви́та	6	4	2	29%		ne rek			
		разви́та	7	4	3	33%	√	√			
737	'liable to shrink; shrinkable'	са́дка	5	4	1	24%	√	√	√		
		садка́	16	7	9	76%		√	√		
738	'grey (of horses); greying (of hair)'	си́ва	13	7	6	62%	√	√	√		√
		сива́	8	4	4	38%			√		
739	'hoarse, husky'	си́пла	10	7	3	48%	√	√	√		√
		сипла́	11	4	7	52%	√		√		
740	'orphaned; (fig.) lonely'	си́ра	10	7	3	50%	√	√	√		√
		сира́	10	3	7	50%	√		√		√



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		x	1								
741	'slimy'	СКЛІЗКА	10	8	2	45%			✓		
		СКЛИЗКА́	12	3	8	55%	✓		✓	✓	
742	'slippery'	СКО́ЛЬЗКА	6	4	2	30%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		СКО́ЛЬЗКА́	14	6	8	70%		✓	✓		
		x	1								
743	'oily (dialectal, of food)'	СЛИ́ЗКА	8	6	2	44%			✓		
		СЛИ́ЗКА́	10	5	5	56%			✓		
		x	3								
744	'savoury, tasty; colourful (of language)'	СМА́ЧНА	8	6	2	38%		✓	✓		✓
		СМА́ЧНА́	13	5	8	62%	✓		✓		
		СМУ́РА						✓	✓	✓	✓
		СМУРА́					✓		✓		
745	'gloomy, sullen' (1)	СМУРНА́	20	11	9	100%					
		x	1								
746	'interfering in everything'	СОВА́	2	2	0	11%			✓		
		СОВА́	16	8	8	89%	✓		✓		
		x	3								
747	'shapely'	СТА́ТНА	7	7	0	35%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		СТА́ТНА́	13	4	9	65%		✓	✓		
		x	1								

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
748	'stable, staunch'	СТОЙКА стойка́	12 9	8 3	4 6	57% 43%	✓	✓	✓		✓
749	'similar'	сходна сходна́	19 2	10 1	9 1	90% 10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	(coll.) 'suitable, acceptable (price)'	сходна сходна́					✓	✓			
750	'granulated (sugar); crushed (gravel)'	сыпка сыпка́	6 15	6 5	0 10	29% 71%			✓		
751	'sharp, tart'	терпка терпка́	7 14	4 7	3 7	33% 67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
752	'swampy, boggy'	топка топка́	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
753	'rotten, mouldering'	трухла трухла́ х	1 15 5	1 7	0 8	6% 94%			✓		
754	'jolty, bumpy'	тра́ска тряска́	9 12	7 4	2 8	43% 57%	✓	✓	✓		✓
755	(coll.) 'strong (of grip); tenacious; skilful; crafty'	хва́тка хватка́	11 10	7 4	4 6	52% 48%	✓	✓	✓		✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
756	(coll.) 'sick, ailing'	хвора хворá	10 11	7 4	3 7	48% 52%	√	√	√	√	√
757	'sickly, puny'	хіла хилá	3 18	2 9	1 9	14% 86%	√	√	√	√	√
758	'trenchant, biting'	хлестка хлесткá	9 12	5 6	4 6	43% 57%	√	√	√	√	√
759	(coll.) 'weak, fragile; rickety'	хліпка хлипкá	6 14	6 5	0 10	31% 69%	√	√	√	√	√
760	(coll.) 'rickety; slushy'	хлюпка хлюпкá	8 13	7 4	1 9	38% 62%	√	√	√	√	√
761	(coll.) 'frail, fragile, rickety'	хлябка хлябкá х	9 10 2	7 4	2 6	47% 53%			√		
762	'gloomy; overcast'	хмура хмурá х	9 10 2	6 4	3 6	47% 53%	√	√	√	√	√
763	'in great demand, popular'	ходка ходкá	10 11	7 4	3 7	48% 52%	√	√	√	√	√
764	'hoarse, wheezy'	хрипла хриплá	14 7	8 3	6 4	67% 33%	√	√	√	√	√

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.√ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
765	'crunchy, crackly'	хру́стка хрустка́ х	10 10 1	7 4	3 6	50% 50%	√	√	√		√
766	(popular speech) 'noisy'	хря́ска хряска́ х	9 10 2	7 4	2 6	47% 53%			√ √		
									√ √		
	'clinging-on; money-grabbing (coll.)'	ца́пка цапка́					√				
767	'costly; valuable'	це́нна ценна́	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	√	√ √	√ √		√
768	'tenacious; stubborn'	це́пка цепка́	12 9	9 2	3 7	57% 43%	√	√ √	√ √		√
769	'clear, precise; legible'	че́тка четка́	10 11	5 6	5 5	48% 52%	√	√ √	√ √	√	√
770	'decorous; well-ordered'	чи́нна чинна́	14 7	8 3	6 4	67% 33%	√	√ √	√ √	√	√
771	'unsteady, rickety'	ша́тка шатка́	11 10	8 3	3 7	52% 48%	√	√ √	√ √		√
772	'puny, frail, weak'	шу́пла шупла́ х	6 14 1	4 7	2 7	30% 70%	√	√ √	√ √	√	√

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No.✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	<b>Note:</b>										
	(1) misprint (for smura) in questionnaire										



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
e) ii) AdjS nt, pl, m											
398	adjS pl 'poor'	бѣдны бѣдны	3 18	3 8	0 10	14% 86%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ dop
399	adjS nt	бѣдно бѣдно	4 16	4 6	0 10	20% 80%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
400	adverb predicative	х бѣдно бѣдно бѣдно	1 21								
401	adjS pl 'white'	бѣлы бѣлы	3.5 17.5	3 8	0.5 9.5	17% 83%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
402	adjS nt	бѣло бѣло	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
403	predicative	бѣло бѣло	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%				✓ ✓	✓ ✓
404	adjS pl 'pale'	блѣдны блѣдны					✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop
405	adjS nt	блѣдно блѣдно	21 10 11	11 6 5	10 4 6	100% 48% 52%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓
406	adjS pl 'close'	близки близкі	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ dop	✓ dop
407	adjS nt	близко близко	21	11	10	100%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
408	adjS pl 'cheerful'	бодры	5	3	2	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
409	adjS nt	бо́дрый бо́дро бо́дро	16 5 16	8 4 7	8 1 9	76% 24% 76%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	dop ✓ ✓
410	adjS pl 'bold'	бо́йки бойки	2.5 18.5	2 9	0.5 9.5	12% 88%	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
411	adjS nt 'sick'	бо́льно бо́льно х	4 16 1	3 8 11	1 8 10	20% 80% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓	ne upot ne upot ✓
412	adverb 'very'	бо́льно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
413	predicative	бо́льно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
415	adjS pl 'quick'	бы́стры бы́стры бы́стры бы́стры	3 18 2 19	2 9 2 9	1 9 0 10	14% 86% 10% 90%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ dop ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
416	adjS pl (-)	ва́жны ва́жны ва́жны ва́жно ва́жно ва́жно	4 17 21	4 7 11	0 10 10	19% 81% 100%	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ neprav ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓	✓ dop ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
417	adjS nt	ва́жно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/predicative	ва́жно							✓		
	adjS pl 'outstanding, great'	вели́ки					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS pl 'big' (adjL = bol'shoi)	вели́ки						✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS pl excessive 'too big'	вели́кий					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		великий						✓	✓		✓
418	adjS pl% 'loyal'	вѣрны верны	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
419	adjS pl ... traditsiiam	вѣрны верны	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	dop ustar ✓	dop ustar ✓			dop
	adverb/parenthetic word	вѣрно							✓		
420	adjS pl 'merry'	вѣсѣлы веселы	3 18	1 10	2 8	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
421	adjS nt	вѣсело весело	18 1	10 0	8 1	86% 5%	✓	dop ✓	✓	✓	✓
		весело	2	1	1	10%					
422	adverb	вѣсело весело	21	11	10	100%			✓		✓
423	predicative	вѣсело весело	21	11	10	100%			✓		nc ✓ nc
424	adjS pl 'visible'	видны видны						dop ustar ✓	ustar ✓	✓	✓
	adjS pl 'important'	видны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		
425	adjS pl 'tasty'	вкусны вкусны	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
426	adjS pl 'moist'	влажны влажны	6 15	4 7	2 8	29% 71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
687	adjS m% 'free'	волен	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		волён	1	0	1	5%	✓	✓			✓
	adjS m 'free to do sg.'	во́лен						ne rek ustar			prost
		волён									✓
427	adjS pl% 'free' (svobodny i ...)	во́льны	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		во́льны	19	9	10	90%		✓	✓		
429	adjS pl 'free to do sg.'	во́льны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
428	adjS nt% 'free'	во́льно	10	6	4	48%	✓		✓	✓	✓
		во́льно	11	5	6	52%					
	adjS nt 'free to do sg.'	во́льно					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
430	adverb 'freely'	во́льно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓			✓
431	predicative ... D + infinitive	во́льно	13.5	7.5	6	64%					
		во́льно	7.5	3.5	4	36%	✓	✓	✓		✓
432	adjS pl 'sharp'	во́стры	1.5	1.5	0	7%				✓	✓
		во́стры	19.5	9.5	10	93%	✓	✓	✓		
433	adjS nt	во́стро	2	2	0	10%				✓	✓
		во́стро	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓		
434	adverb in set-phrase (derzhite ukho ... !)	во́стро	1	0	1	5%					
		во́стро	19	10	9	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		x	1								
435	adjS pl 'harmful'	вре́дны	1	1	0	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		вре́дны	20	10	10	95%		✓	✓		dop
	adverb/predicative	вре́дно							✓		
	adjS pl 'tall, high'	высо́ки						✓	✓	✓	✓
		высо́ки					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
436	adjS pl excessive	высо́ки	21	11	10	100%					



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
437	adjS pl 'excessive' (... dlia menia)	ВЫСО́КИ	2	1	1	10%					
		ВЫСО́КІ	19	10	9	90%					
438	adjS nt	ВЫСО́КО	1	0	1	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		ВЫСО́КО́	20	11	9	95%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
439	adverb	ВЫСО́КО	1	0	1	5%		dop			✓
		ВЫСО́КО́	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓			✓
440	adjS pl 'deep'	ГЛУБО́КИ						✓	✓	✓	✓
		ГЛУБО́КІ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
441	adverb	ГЛУБО́КО						dop			✓
		ГЛУБО́КО́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓			✓
442	adjS nt	ГЛУБО́КО	2	0	2	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		ГЛУБО́КО́	19	11	8	90%	✓	dop		✓	✓
443	adjS pl 'stupid'	ГЛУ́ПЫ	6.5	2	4.5	31%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ГЛУ́ПЫ́	14.5	9	5.5	69%		dop	✓		
445	adjS pl% (-)	ГЛУ́ХИ	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ГЛУ́ХІ́	19	9	10	90%		dop (1)	✓		
		ГЛУ́ХИ						✓			
444	adjS pl + k 'deaf to'	ГЛУ́ХІ́	6.5	2	4.5	31%		dop			
		ГЛУ́ХИ	14.5	9	5.5	69%		✓			
446	adjS pl 'vile'	ПНУ́СНЫ	5	4	1	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ПНУ́СНЫ́	16	7	9	76%		✓	✓		
447	adjS pl 'suitable, fit'	ГО́ДНЫ	6.5	4	2.5	31%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ГО́ДНЫ́	14.5	7	7.5	69%		✓	✓	✓	dop



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
448	adjS pl 'hungry'	го́лодны	6	4	2	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́лодны́	15	7	8	71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS nt	го́лодно					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
449	adverb	го́лодно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́лодно́									ne
450	predicative	го́лодно	21	11	10	100%			✓		✓
		го́лодно́									ne
451	adjS pl 'naked'	го́лы	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́лы́	2	2	0	10%			✓		
452	adjS nt	го́ло	20.5	10.5	10	98%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́ло́	0.5	0.5	0	2%					
453	predicative	го́ло	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓			✓
		го́ло́					dop				✓
455	... adjS pl% or (-) 'proud'	го́рды	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́рды́	18	8	10	90%	✓	dop	✓	✓	dop
		х	1								
454	adjS pl + kem-to, chem-to	го́рды	1	1	0	5%	dop				
		го́рды́	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓			
457	adjS pl 'bitter'	го́рьки	5	5	0	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		го́рьки́	16	6	10	76%	dop		✓		
456	adjS pl excessive ( ... dlia menia)	го́рьки	4	4	0	19%					
		го́рьки́	17	7	10	81%			✓		
	adverb/predicative	го́рько									
458	adjS pl (my ... ) (-)	гре́шны	3	2	1	14%			✓	✓	✓





No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
467	adjS pl 'thick, dense'	густы густы́	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
468	adverb (eto bylo ... ) 'a long time ago'	давнó	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		
469	adverb (ia ... chital eto)	давнó	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		
470	adjS pl 'distant'	далёки далекий	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
471	adjS nt	далёко далеко́	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
472	adverb	далёко далеко́	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
	adverb ( ... ne)	далеко́					✓	✓			
685	adjS m 'long'	длинен длинён	13 8	6 5	7 3	62% 38%	✓				✓ ne
686	adjS m excessive	длинен длинён	15 6	8 3	7 3	71% 29%	✓	lne rek			
473	adjS pl	длинны длинны́	6 15	3 8	3 7	29% 71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
474	adjS pl excessive	длинны длинны́	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
475	adjS nt	длинно длинно́	6 15	5 6	1 9	29% 71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
476	adjS nt excessive	длинно длинно́	7 14	6 5	1 9	33% 67%	✓	dop	✓		

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
477	adjS pl 'good, kind'	дóбры добры добры	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
479	adjS pl (bud'te ...) adjS nt	дóбро добрó дóбро	13 8	9 2	4 6	62% 38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
478	adverb	дóбро добрó дóбро	11 10	6 5	5 5	52% 48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	particle	дóбро добрó					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	conjunction	дóбро					✓	✓			
	adjS m 'necessary'	дóлжен					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
480	adjS pl	должны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS nt	должно					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
481	set-phrase ( ... byt')	должно	21	11	10	100%					
482	predicative (eg ... ostat'sia/sdelat' kak ...)	дóлжно должно	7 14	5 6	2 8	33% 67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	ne
483	adjS pl 'friendly'	дружны дружны					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
			21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
484	adjS pl 'rascally'	дряны дряны	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
485	adjS nt	дряно дряно	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
684	adjS m 'evil'	дурен дурен	3 18	3 8	0 10	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	razg
486	adjS pl	дурны					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	adverb/predicative	дурный дурно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		dop
487	adjS pl 'greedy'	жадный жадны	9 12	6 5	3 7	43% 57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
488	adjS pl 'yellow'	жёлты желты ж[о]лты	7 13 1	4 6 1	3 7 0	33% 62% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ✓
489	adjS nt	жёлто желто x	15 5 1	9 2	6 3	75% 25%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ✓
490	adjS pl 'hard'	жёстки жесткі ж[о]стки	15 6	6 5	9 1	71% 29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
491	adjS pl 'cruel'	жестόки жестоки	20 1	10 1	10 0	95% 5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ne
493	adjS nt	жестόко жестокό	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ne
492	adverb	жестόко жестокό	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ne
494	adjS pl 'fatty'	жирны жирны	3 18	2 9	1 9	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ✓
495	adjS pl 'sonorous'	звұчны звучны	4.5 16.5	4 7	0.5 9.5	21% 79%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ ✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
496	adjS pl 'green'	зе́лены зеле́ны	7 14	4 7	3 7	33% 67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
497	adjS pl 'earthy'	зе́мны	21	11	10	100%			✓ zaimd		
498	adjS nt	зе́мнó	21	11	10	100%			✓		
499	adverb 'to the ground'	зе́мнó	3	1	2	16%	✓		✓		
		зе́мнó	16	9	7	84%					
		x	2								
500	adjS pl 'distinguished, aristocratic'	знáтны знáтны	5 15	3 7	2 8	25% 75%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		x	1					✓	✓		
501	adjS pl 'bitter'	кислы́ кислы́	4 17	3 8	1 9	19% 81%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
	adjS m 'short'	кóроток кóроток					✓	dop ustar			✓
502	adjS m excessive	кóроток кóротки	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS pl	кóротки						dop ustar		✓	✓
		кóроткí	9	4	5	43%	✓				✓
503	adjS pl excessive	кóротки	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓			✓
		кóроткí	1	1	0	5%	✓	✓			✓
504	adjS nt	кóротко	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓		✓	✓
		кóротко						dop ustar		✓	✓
505	adjS nt excessive	кóроткó кóротко	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓			✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
506	adverb	коротко кóротко корóтко корóтко	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop ✓ dop ustar			✓ ✓ ✓
507	adjS pl 'cross-eyed'	кóсы кóсы	9 12	5 6	4 6	43% 57%	✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓	✓
508	adjS pl 'red'	красны красны	7 14	5 6	2 8	33% 67%	✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓
509	adjS nt	красно красно	5 16	5 6	0 10	24% 76%	✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	
510	adverb 'redly'	красно красно красно x	12.5 7.5 1	8 3	4.5 4.5	62% 38%					✓
511	adverb 'eloquently'	красно красно	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓			✓
512	adjS pl 'strong'	крепки крепки	4 17	4 7	0 10	19% 81%	✓	✓ dop	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓
513	adjS pl excessive	крепки крепки	5 16	4 7	1 9	24% 76%					
514	adjS pl 'circular'	круглы круглы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓
515	adjS pl 'coarse, large-scale'	крупны крупны x	2 17 2	2 8	0 9	11% 89%	✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
516	adjS pl 'steep; sharp'	кру́ты круты́	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
517	adjS m 'light; easy'	лёток лётки	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
518	adjS nt	лепки́ лётко	4 17	2 9	2 8	19% 81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
519	adverb	лепо́	21	11	10	100%			✓		
520	predicative	лепо́	21	11	10	100%			✓		
521	adjS pl (dial.) 'evil, bad'	ли́хи лихи́ х лихо	20 1	11	9	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
522	adjS pl 'able'	ло́вки ловки́	7.5 13.5	5 6	2.5 7.5	36% 64%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
523	adjS pl excessive 'too small'	ма́лы	21	11	10	100%	✓				
524	adjS pl	ма́лы ма́лы ма́ло	21 21	11 11	10 10	100% 100%	dop ustar	✓	✓	✓	✓
525	adverb	ма́ло	1.5	0	1.5	7%	dop ustar				
526	adjS nt	ма́ло	19.5	11	8.5	93%	✓		✓	✓	✓
527	adjS nt excessive	ма́ло ма́ло	1 20	0 11	1 9	5% 95%					
528	predicative (eg dva dollara malo)	ма́ло	21	11	10	100%			✓		

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (110)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	quantitative pronoun (+ G)	мáло						✓	✓		✓
529	adjS pl 'fine; fine-ground'	мéлки мелкі́	4 17	3 8	1 9	19% 81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
530	adjS pl (literal) 'dead'	мёртвы мертвы́	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
531	adjS pl (figurative)	мёртвы мертвы́	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop		✓	✓
532	adjS nt (literal)	мёртво мертвó	5 16	4 7	1 9	24% 76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
533	adjS nt (figurative)	мёртво мертвó	2 19	2 9	0 10	10% 90%	✓	dop		✓	✓
534	predicative	мёртво мертвó	4 17	3 8	1 9	19% 81%	✓	✓			
	adverb 'firmly, strongly'	мёртво				✓					
535	adjS pl 'nice, kind'	ми́лы милы́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
536	adjS pl 'wet'	мо́кры мокры́	6 15	5 6	1 9	29% 71%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
538	adjS nt	мо́кро мокрó	13 8	6 5	7 3	62% 38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
537	predicative	мо́кро мокрó	20 1	11 0	9 1	95% 5%					✓
539	adjS pl 'gloomy'	мра́чны мрачны́	5 16	4 7	1 9	24% 76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	adjS f 'complicated, abstruse'	мудрёна мудрёна́					✓	✓	✓	✓	
540	adjS pl	мудрёны	13	6	7	62%	✓	dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		мудрёны́	8	5	3	38%		dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
541	adjS nt	мудрёно	7.5	6	1.5	36%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		мудрёно́	13.5	5	8.5	64%		dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
543	adverb	мудрёно	15	9	6	71%			✓	✓	✓
		мудрёно́	6	2	4	29%			✓	✓	✓
	predicative ( ... v etom razobrat'sia)	мудрёно́					✓	✓	✓		✓
542	predicative (ne ..., chto )	мудрёно́	21	11	10	100%					
544	adjS pl 'wise'	мудры мудры́					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		мудры́	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓		
545	adjS pl 'turbid'	мутны мутны́	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		мутны́	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓		
546	adjS pl 'soft'	мямки мямки́	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		мямки́	17	8	9	81%		dop	✓		
547	adjS pl 'gentle'	нежны нежны́	1.5 19.5	1.5 9.5	0 10	7% 93%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
548	adjS pl 'low, short'	низки низки́	6 14	6 5	0 9	30% 70%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓ dop
		х	1						✓		
549	adjS pl 'new'	новы новы́	14	8	6	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		новЫ́	7	3	4	33%		✓	✓	✓	dop
550	adjS pl 'tedious, boring'	ну́дны	9	6	3	45%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ну́дны	11	5	6	55%		✓	✓	✓	
		х	1								
	adverb/predicative	ну́дно							✓		
551	adjS pl 'necessary'	ну́жны						dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		ну́жны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
552	adjS nt	ну́жно	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ну́жно́	2	1	1	10%	ne	!neprav			
553	predicative ( + infinitive)	ну́жно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		✓
554	adjS pl 'common'	о́бщи	12	7	5	60%	✓	✓	✓	✓(2)	
		о́бщи	8	4	4	40%				✓(3)	
		х	1								
556	adjS pl 'general'	о́бщи	8	4	4	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓(3)	
		о́бщи	13	7	6	62%	✓	dop	✓		
	adjS nt 'general'	о́бще					✓	✓	✓	✓(4)	
		о́бщ					✓	✓			✓
555	adverb	о́бщ	18	9	9	100%	✓	✓			
		о́бщ	3								
		х									
1457	adjS m 'witty'	о́стр	2	1	1	10%	✓			✓	
		о́стр	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓			✓
	adjS m 'sharp' (lit.)	о́стр					✓	dop			
		о́стр					✓	✓			
557	adjS pl 'witty'	о́стры	3	2	1	14%	✓				
		о́стры	18	9	9	86%	✓	✓		✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
559	adjS pl 'sharp' (literal)	остры	3	2	1	14%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
		остры́	18	9	9	86%		✓	✓		
560	adjS nt 'witty'	остро	3	2	1	14%	✓				
		остро́	18	9	9	86%	✓				
561	adjS nt 'sharp' (literal)	остро	2	1	1	10%	✓	dop	✓	✓	
		остро́	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓		
558	adverb 'wittily'	остро	6.5	4	2.5	31%					✓
		остро́	14.5	7	7.5	69%	✓	✓		✓	
562	adverb 'sharply'	остро	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓			✓
		остро́	2	0	2	10%		✓			
563	adjS pl 'brightly coloured'	пёстры	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пестры́	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓	✓	✓
564	adjS nt	пёстро	6	4.5	1.5	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пестро́	15	6.5	8.5	71%		✓	✓	✓	✓
565	adverb 'pretentiously'	пёстро	16	9	7	76%					✓
		пестро́	5	2	3	24%	✓				✓
566	adjS pl 'thick, dense, strong'	плотны	8.5	6	2.5	40%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		плотны́	12.5	5	7.5	60%		✓	✓		
567	adjS pl 'bad'	плохи	15.5	9	6.5	74%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		плохи́	5.5	2	3.5	26%		dop	✓		
	adverb/predicative	плохо							✓		
569	adjS pl 'full of sg.'	по́льны	3	1	2	14%		dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		полны́	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
573	adjS pl 'stout'	по́льны	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓		
		полны́	19	9	10	90%		✓	✓		



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	adjS pl 'full, ie exhaustive'	по́лы					✓	✓	✓		
		по́лы						✓	✓		
570	adjS nt 'full of sg.'	по́лно	1	1	0	5%		dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		по́лно	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS nt 'stout'	по́лно					✓	✓	✓		
	adjS nt 'full, ie exhaustive'	по́лно					✓	✓	✓		
571	adverb 'fully/in full' (eg ob"iasnit')	по́лно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb 'until full' (nalivat')	по́лно								✓	✓
		по́лно								✓	✓
	predicative ( ... narodu) 'there are a lot of'	по́лно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
572	like a verbal imperative + infinitive										
568	'that will do, stop doing sg.'	по́лно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
574	adjS pl 'fresh (of water, ie not salt)'	пресны́	6	3	3	29%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		пресны́	15	8	7	71%			✓		
575	adjS pl 'simple'	просто́						dop ustar	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/predicative/particle	просто́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
576	adjS pl 'sound, stable, solid'	прочи́ны	3	3	0	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		прочи́ны	18	8	10	86%		✓	✓	✓	dop
577	adjS pl 'straight'	прямы́	5	3	2	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/particle	прямы́	16	8	8	76%	✓	✓	✓		
		прямо́					✓	✓	✓		
578	adjS pl 'empty'	пу́сты					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		пусты́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		
579	adjS pl 'drunk'	пья́ны пья́ны	2 19	1 10	1 9	10% 90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
580	adjS pl 'rare, seldom'	ре́дки редки́	6.5 14.5	4 7	2.5 7.5	31% 69%	✓	✓ dop	✓	✓	✓
581	adjS pl 'lively, playful'	ре́звы резвы́ х	4 16 1	3 8	1 8	20% 80%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
582	adjS pl 'shrill'	ре́зки резки́	6 15	5 6	1 9	29% 71%	✓	✓ dop	✓	✓	✓
583	adjS pl 'level, even'	ро́вны ровны́ ро́вно	5 16	4 7	1 9	24% 76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/predicative/conjunction								✓		
584	adjS pl 'fresh'	све́жи свежи́ свежо́ свежо́ свежо́	3 18	2 9	1 9	14% 86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS nt adverb predicative						✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
585	adjS pl 'light; bright'	све́тлы светлы́ све́тло	3 18	2 9	1 9	14% 86%	✓			✓	✓
586	adjS nt	све́тло	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
588	adverb	свѣтло	8	6	2	38%					✓
		свѣтлѡ	13	5	8	62%			✓		
587	predicative	свѣтлѡ	21	11	10	100%			✓		✓
683	adjS m 'strong'	сѣлен						dop ustar			✓
		сѣлѣн	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓			✓
589	adjS pl	сѣльны	2	2	0	10%		dop ustar	ustar	✓	✓
		сѣльнѣ	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
590	adjS nt	сѣльно	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сѣльнѡ	18	9	9	86%		hneprav			
591	adjS pl 'bad'	сквѣрны	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сквернѣ	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓		
592	adjS pl 'inclined to, prone to'	склѡнны	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓		✓	✓
		склюннѣ								✓	
593	adjS pl 'modest'	скромны	5	4	1	25%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скромнѣ	15	6	9	75%		✓	✓		
		х	1								
594	adjS pl 'scanty; slender; meagre'	скудны	5.5	4.5	1	26%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скуднѣ	15.5	6.5	9	74%		✓	✓	✓	
595	adjS pl 'miserly'	скупы	5.5	4	1.5	26%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		скупѣ	15.5	7	8.5	74%		✓	✓		
596	adjS pl 'boring'	сучны						✓	✓	✓	✓
		сучнѣ	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓		dop



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
	adverb/predicative	СКУ́чно							✓		
597	adjS pl 'weak'	сла́бы	8	3	5	38%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сла́бы	13	8	5	62%		dop	✓	✓	dop
598	adjS nt	сла́бо	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сла́бо	9	4	5	43%					
599	predicative (vam eto sdelat')	сла́бо	1	1	0	5%					
		сла́бо	20	10	10	95%		✓	✓		
600	adjS pl 'complex'	сло́жны	3	3	0	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сло́жны	18	8	10	86%		✓	✓	✓	✓
	adjS nt	сло́жно					✓	✓	✓		
	adverb/predicative	сло́жно							✓		
601	adjS pl 'brave'	сме́лы	4	3	1	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сме́лы	17	8	9	81%		✓	✓	✓	
682	adjS m 'peaceful'	сми́рен	11	6	5	52%	✓				✓
		смире́н	9	4	5	43%					dop
		смире́н	1	1	0	5%					
602	adjS pl	сми́рны	5	5	0	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сми́рны	16	6	10	76%		✓	✓		
603	adjS pl 'dark-complexioned'	сму́глы	3	3	0	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сму́глы	18	8	10	86%		✓	✓	✓	
604	adjS pl 'juicy'	со́чны	5	4	1	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		со́чны	16	7	9	76%		✓	✓		

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (/21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
605	adjS pl 'salted'	со́лоны	16	8	8	84%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		со́лоны	3	1	2	16%		✓	✓	✓	
		х	2								
606	adjS pl excessive	со́лоны	11	5	6	52%					
		со́лоны	10	6	4	48%					
	adverb	со́лоно					✓				✓
607	adjS pl 'ripe'	спéлы	20	11	9	95%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		спелы́	1	0	1	5%		✓	✓		
608	adjS pl 'old'	ста́ры	7	4	3	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ста́ры	14	7	7	67%		dop	✓	✓	✓
609	adjS nt	ста́ро	1	1	0	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ста́ро	20	10	10	95%			✓	✓	✓
610	adjS nt in set-phrase (eto staro!)	ста́ро	1	1	0	5%					
		ста́ро	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓			✓
	adverb	ста́ро					✓				
611	adjS pl 'terrible'	стра́шны	3	2	1	14%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		страшны́	18	9	9	86%		✓	✓		✓
612	adjS pl 'strict'	стро́ги	10	4	6	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		стро́ги	11	7	4	52%		dop	✓		
613	adjS pl 'slender'	стро́йны	2	2	0	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		стройны́	19	9	10	90%		✓	✓		
614	adjS pl (dial./obsolete) 'defected'	су́мны	6	4	2	33%	✓		✓		
		сумны́	12	5	7	67%			✓	✓	



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		х	3								
615	adjS pl 'dry'	сухи	5.5	3.5	2	26%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		сухі	15.5	7.5	8	74%		dop	✓		
	adjS m 'happy'	счастлив					✓	✓	✓		✓
		счастлів						dop ustar	ustar		✓
	adjS f	счастлива					✓	✓	✓		✓
		счастліва						dop ustar	ustar		✓
616	adjS pl	счастливы	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		счастлівы					✓	dop ustar	ustar		✓
	adjS nt	счастливо					✓	✓	✓		✓
		счастліво					✓	dop ustar	ustar		✓
	adverb	счастливо						✓			
		счастліво					✓	dop ustar			
	adverb in set-phrase ( ... ostavat'sia)	счастліво									
	adjS pl 'hard'	твёрды					✓	✓	✓		
		тверді					✓	✓	✓		
617	adjS pl 'dark'	тёмны	1.5	1	0.5	7%				✓	✓
		темні	19.5	10	9.5	93%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
620	adjS nt	тёмно	5	4	1	24%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		темно́	16	7	9	76%	✓		✓	✓	✓
619	adverb	тёмно	5	4	1	24%					
		темно́	16	7	9	76%			✓		
618	predicative	тёмно						inprav			ne
		темно́	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓		✓

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
621	adjS pl 'warm; hot'	тёплы теплы́	3	2	1	14%				✓	✓
			18	9	9	86%	✓		✓	✓	✓
622	adjS nt	тёпло теплó	2	2	0	11%				✓	✓
			17	9	8	89%	✓		✓	✓	✓
		x	2								
624	adverb	тёпло теплó									ne
			21	11	10	100%	✓		✓	✓	✓
623	predicative	тёпло теплó					ne				ne
			21	11	10	100%	✓		✓		✓
625	adjS pl 'tight'	тёсны тесны́	2	2	0	10%				✓	✓
			19	9	10	90%	✓		✓	✓	dop
628	adjS pl excessive	тёсны тесны́	2	2	0	10%					
			19	9	10	90%	✓		✓		
627	adjS nt	тёсно тесно́	14	7	7	67%	✓			✓	✓
			7	4	3	33%					
629	adjS nt excessive	тёсно тесно́	9	4	5	43%			✓		
			12	7	5	57%	dop		✓		
630	adverb	тёсно тесно́	21	11	10	100%			✓		
626	predicative	тёсно тесно́	18	9	9	86%	✓		✓		
			3	2	1	14%	Inprav				
631	adjS pl 'peaceful, quiet'	тихи тихи́	7	3	4	33%	✓		✓	✓	✓
			14	8	6	67%	dop		✓		
632	adjS pl 'fat'	то́лсты толсты́	6.5 14.5	5.5 5.5	1 9	31% 69%	✓		✓	✓	✓
											dop
633	adjS pl 'thin'	то́нки	3	2	1	14%	✓		✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		ТО́НКИ	18	9	9	86%		✓	✓		
634	adjS pl 'exact'	ТО́ЧНЫ	2	2	0	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/parenthetic word/particle/conjunction	ТО́ЧНЫ	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓	✓		
		ТО́ЧНО							✓		
635	adjS pl 'sober'	трезвы́	7	1	6	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		трезвы́	14	10	4	67%	✓	✓	✓		
636	adjS pl 'difficult'	трудны́	2	1	1	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	adverb/predicative	трудны́	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	dop
		трудо́							✓		
637	adjS pl 'blunt'	ту́пы	2	0	2	10%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ту́пы	19	11	8	90%	✓	✓	✓		
1310	adjS pl 'dull; matt'	ту́склы	9	5	4	43%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
638		ту́склы́	12	6	6	57%	✓	✓	✓		
639	adjS pl 'stout; fertile'	ту́чны	5	5	0	24%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ту́чны	16	6	10	76%	✓	✓	✓	✓	
640	adjS pl 'courageous'	уда́лы	6	1	5	32%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		уда́лы	13	9	4	68%	✓	✓	✓		
		х	2								
641	adjS pl 'tight; narrow'	у́зки	7	5	2	33%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		у́зки	14	6	8	67%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
642	adjS pl excessive	ЎЗКИ	2	2	0	10%			✓		
		ЎЗКЇ	19	9	10	90%		✓	✓		
644	adjS nt	ЎЗКО	10	6	4	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		ЎЗКО́	11	5	6	52%					
643	adjS nt excessive	ЎЗКО	15	7	8	71%		✓	✓		
		ЎЗКО́	6	4	2	29%		dop	✓		
645	adverb	ЎЗКО	21	11	10	100%					
647	adjS pl 'clever'	УМНЫ									
		УМНЫ́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
646	adjS nt	УМНО	4	3	1	19%	✓			✓	✓
		УМНО́	17	8	9	81%		✓		✓	✓
648	adverb	УМНО	15.5	10	5.5	74%		inc rek			
		УМНО́	5.5	1	4.5	26%	✓	✓			
	adjS m 'sly'	хитёр					✓	✓			✓
649	adjS pl	хитры						dop	✓	✓	✓
		хитры́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
650	adjS nt	хитро	2	2	0	10%	✓	dop	✓	✓	
		хитро́	19	9	10	90%		✓	✓	✓	
651	adverb	хитро	19	11	8	90%					✓
		хитро́	2	0	2	10%					✓
681	adjS m 'tipsy, drunk'	хмѐлен	7	4	3	35%		dop			
		хмѐлѐн	13	7	6	65%	✓	✓			
		х	1								
652	adjS pl	хмельны́	2	2	0	10%		✓		✓	nar poet
		хмельны́	19	9	10	90%	✓	✓		✓	✓
653	adjS nt	хмельно́						✓		✓	nar poet

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
		хмельно́	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓		✓	✓
654	adjS pl 'cold'	хо́лодны	10	5	5	48%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		хо́лодны	11	6	5	52%	✓	✓	✓		✓
655	adjS nt	хо́лодно	11	3	8	55%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		хо́лодно	2	2	0	10%					
		хо́лодно́	7	6	1	35%					ne
		х	1								
656	adverb	хо́лодно	21	11	10	100%			✓		✓
		хо́лодно́									ne
657	predicative	хо́лодно	21	11	10	100%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		хо́лодно́					неправ				ne
658	adjS pl 'brave'	хра́бры	4	1	3	19%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		хра́бры	17	10	7	81%	✓	✓	✓		
659	adjS pl 'thin'	ху́ды	1	1	0	5%	✓	✓	✓	✓(2)	✓
		ху́ды	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓		
	adjS pl 'full of holes'	ху́ды					✓	✓	✓		✓
		ху́ды					✓	✓	✓		
660	adjS pl 'bad'	ху́ды	9	5	4	43%	✓	✓	✓		✓
		ху́ды	12	6	6	57%	✓	✓	✓		
	adverb/predicative 'badly'	ху́до					✓	✓	✓		
661	adjS pl 'black'	че́рны	1	1	0	5%				✓	✓
		че́рны	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
662	adjS nt	че́рно	3	1	2	14%				✓	✓
		че́рно	18	10	8	86%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
663	predicative	че́рно	21	11	10	100%	✓				✓



No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (11)	35+ (10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
664	adjS pl 'stale; callous'	чёрсты	1	0	1	5%					
		чёрсты	1	1	0	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		черсты	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	dop	
665	adjS pl 'honourable'	чёсны	1	1	0	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		честны	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓			
666	adjS pl 'clean'	чисты	1	1	0	5%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		чисты	20	10	10	95%	✓	✓	✓	dop	
667	adjS pl 'bizarre'	чудны					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		чўдны					✓	✓			✓
		чўдны	7.5	3.5	4	36%					
		чудны	13.5	7.5	6	64%					
668	adjS pl (vechera)	чудны	16.5	7.5	9	79%					
		чудны	4.5	3.5	1	21%			✓		
		чудно									
669	adjS pl 'foreign'	чўжды	12	7	5	57%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
		чужды	9	4	5	43%		dop	✓		
670	adjS pl 'broad, wide'	широ́ки	2	1	1	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		широкі	19	10	9	90%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
671	adjS pl excessive	широ́ки	21	11	10	100%		✓	✓		
673	adjS nt	широ́ко	2	0	2	10%		✓	✓	✓	✓
		широко́	19	11	8	90%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
672	adjS nt excessive	широ́ко	1	0	1	5%					
		широко́	20	11	9	95%		✓		✓	

No.	Comments	Word-form	Ukiah No. ✓ (21)	-35 (/11)	35+ (/10)	%total	SU 1993	OS 1989	Zal. 1977	Red. 1971	A&O 1959
674	adverb	широко широкó	21	11	10	100%	✓	dop			✓
675	adjS pl 'noisy'	шумны шумны́	4 17	3 8	1 9	19% 81%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
680	adjS m (coll.) 'smart, bright, sharp'	шустер шустёр шустры шустры́	21 3 18	11 3 8	10 0 10	100% 14% 86%	✓	✓			✓
676	adjS pl										
677	adjS pl 'generous'	щёдры щедры́	1 20	1 10	0 10	5% 95%	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
678	adjS pl 'bright'	ярки яркí	7.5 13.5	5 6	2.5 7.5	36% 64%	✓	dop	✓	✓	✓
679	adjS pl 'clear'	ясны ясны́	4 17	2 9	2 8	19% 81%		✓	✓	✓	dop
	adverb/predicative	ясно					✓		✓		
	Notes:										
	(1) with meaning 'soundless'										
	(2) no further information given; assumed that the semantic distinction is not drawn										
	(3) Obshchii is listed twice, once with meaning 'common', and once with no further comment (taken as meaning 'general')										